SUTTELL, BRIAN WILLIAM, Ph.D. Campus to Counter: Civil Rights Activism in Raleigh and Durham, North Carolina, 1960-1963. (2017)
Directed by Dr. Charles C. Bolton. 296 pp.

This work investigates civil rights activism in Raleigh and Durham, North Carolina, in the early 1960s, especially among students at Shaw University, Saint Augustine's College (Saint Augustine's University today), and North Carolina College at Durham (North Carolina Central University today). Their significance in challenging traditional practices in regard to race relations has been underrepresented in the historiography of the civil rights movement. Students from these three historically black schools played a crucial role in bringing about the end of segregation in public accommodations and the reduction of discriminatory hiring practices. While student activists often proceeded from campus to the lunch counters to participate in sit-in demonstrations, their actions also represented a counter to businesspersons and politicians who sought to preserve a segregationist view of Tar Heel hospitality.

The research presented in this dissertation demonstrates the ways in which ideas of academic freedom gave additional ideological force to the civil rights movement and helped garner support from students and faculty from the "Research Triangle" schools comprised of North Carolina State College (North Carolina State University today), Duke University, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Many students from both the "Protest Triangle" (my term for the activists at the three historically black schools) and "Research Triangle" schools viewed efforts by local and state politicians to thwart student participation in sit-ins and other forms of protest as a restriction of their academic freedom. Despite the rich historiography on the American civil rights

movement as well as several scholarly works addressing academic freedom, there has been a lack of emphasis on the ways in which civil rights activism and academic freedom were interconnected in the early 1960s.

This project is the result of extensive archival research and the analysis of primary and secondary sources. The author has conducted twenty-nine interviews of civil rights activists and members of the Raleigh and Durham communities, in addition to interviews of nationally recognized civil rights leaders such as Andrew Young and Wyatt Tee Walker. Interviewees from Raleigh and Durham were asked to complete surveys, which were utilized to provide a more systematic method for the author to form assertions and analyze patterns of experiences among the activists.

CAMPUS TO COUNTER: CIVIL RIGHTS ACTIVISM IN RALEIGH AND DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA, 1960-1963

by

Brian William Suttell

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of The Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
2017

Approved by

Charles C. Bolton
Committee Chair

© 2017 Brian William Suttell

To Jim and Deb, with great respect

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation, written by Brian William Suttell, has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of The Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Chair Charles C. Bolton

Committee Members Mark Elliott

Peter Villella

Jeff Jones

October 2, 2017
Date of Acceptance by Committee

October 2, 2017
Date of Final Oral Examination

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the civil rights activists whom I interviewed for this project, both for their time and for their contributions to social justice in the United States.

I also wish to thank my advisory committee for providing guidance for this dissertation, as well as with my development as a historian and teacher. The chairman of my advisory committee, Dr. Charles Bolton, has had a profound impact on the way in which I approach historical issues in my writing and teaching. Dr. Mark Elliott's commitment to my work and in supporting fellow Ph.D. candidates was most evident in his leadership of a "Dissertation Group," in which students provided revisions and suggestions to one another under his tutelage. In addition to serving as helpful teaching mentors, Dr. Peter Villella and Dr. Jeff Jones provided helpful ideas on ways to improve my dissertation.

I also want to acknowledge the assistance I received from several archivists in my efforts to locate important documents, especially Frederick Sills, Jr. at Saint Augustine's University in Raleigh, Tom Clark at Shaw University in Raleigh, Andre Vann at North Carolina Central University in Durham, and Cynthia P. Lewis at the King Library and Archive in Atlanta, Georgia.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The scene was festive with a tinge of solemnity as a group of citizens and civil rights activists from Raleigh arrived at the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom on August 28, 1963. Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "I Have a Dream" speech was the apogee of a day of speeches and music by the likes of John Lewis, A. Philip Randolph, Roy Wilkins, Floyd McKissick, Mahalia Jackson, and Bob Dylan. But the individuals from Raleigh were not mere *witnesses* to history; they were *participants* in a historic moment that was a public and national display of years of struggle for increased freedom. The March on Washington was not only a story about a particularly inspiring speech, but about the two hundred thousand-plus stories of the experiences that participants brought with them, and about the thousands and thousands of activists whose actions had paved the way for them to participate in this historic event. Whereas the initial idea for a March on Washington was brought forth by A. Philip Randolph two decades prior, the true force and momentum for the event initiated largely from the actions of students at historically black college campuses in Greensboro, Raleigh, Durham, Nashville, Montgomery, and other cities and towns throughout the South. Through the use of sit-ins and other direct challenges to segregation, student activists had

brought significant changes to existing conceptions about race relations in the South and throughout the country prior to the March on Washington.[1]

Students from Shaw University, Saint Augustine's College (now Saint Augustine's University), and North Carolina College (NCC) at Durham (now North Carolina Central University), played crucial roles in shaping the goals, strategies, and outcomes of the civil rights movement in Raleigh and Durham from 1960-1963. Students from these historically black institutions took the lead in pushing for changes in policies regarding public accommodations and racial segregation in the two cities. They were part of a broader student movement that applied pressure to local businesspersons and local and state officials to dismantle legal segregation as well as segregation based upon social tradition. By the time of the March on Washington in late August 1963, the majority of lunch counters, restaurants, and theaters in Raleigh and Durham had already desegregated, and several establishments had altered their racially discriminatory hiring practices.[2] The March on Washington represented a highly publicized event that was in many ways a climax of three years of heightened protest largely initiated in the dorm rooms, courtyards, student council rooms, and auditoriums of the black colleges in the South and sustained in the streets, lunch counters, restaurants, and theaters of several cities.

---

[1] Jon Phelps, "McKissick in Key Role: Number From City In March," *Durham Morning Herald*, 29 August 1963, 1B; "Raleigh 'Marchers' Report On Experience," *Carolinian*, 7 September 1963; Millie Dunn Veasey, phone interview by the author, digital recording, June 27, 2016; Bruce Lightner, interview by the author, Raleigh, North Carolina, June 16, 2016; Carrie Gaddy Brock, interview by the author, Raleigh, March 2, 2016; Vannie C. Culmer, phone interview by the author, digital recording, January 26, 2017; Pete Cunningham, phone interview by the author, digital recording, June 21, 2016

[2] Jonathan Friendly, "76 Business Firms Here Integrating," *News and Observer*, 6 June 1963, 1; "City-Wide Move: Business Firms Here Drop Racial Barriers," *News and Observer*, 20 June 1963, 1; Durham AP, "Bans Lifting at Durham," *News and Observer*, 5 June 1963, 1; Jon Phelps, "90 Pct. of Durham Eating Facilities Now Desegregated," *Durham Morning Herald*, 19 June 1963, 1.

For several generations prior to the 1960s, African Americans recognized the important role that education played in helping bring about increased freedom. My research suggests that the student activists in Raleigh and Durham in the early 1960s saw their involvement in civil rights demonstrations as *part* of their education.[3] The opportunities in a segregated society were not equivalent to the educational attainment of students at historically black colleges. Thus, they recognized that creating a more open society without the restraints placed upon them through segregation would play a role in increasing their opportunities. David Forbes, who became one of the most important student protest leaders in Raleigh in the early 1960s recalls that even as far back as elementary school, "black teachers always said, we are teaching you to your possibility because what we are teaching you may not be able to be fully exercised now, but the time will come when you can. So there was always that forward view that things were going to change."[4] More so than any other generation of activists, those of the early 1960s pushed for those changes, and they viewed their involvement as part of their education and as a way of opening opportunities for their own future and that of their race.

Since student civil rights activists in Raleigh and Durham viewed the demonstrations as part of their education, they also adamantly opposed any attempts to restrict their rights to protest. In this sense, civil rights activism and an expanded vision of academic freedom that extended beyond the gates of the college were interrelated. Any efforts by city or state officials or college administrators to discourage the protests

[3] See survey in appendix.
[4] David Forbes, interview by the author, digital recording, 13 April 2016, Raleigh.

were perceived by the protestors as well as sympathetic white students from other North Carolina colleges as infringements upon their academic freedom.[5]

Some students and faculty from the primarily (and almost exclusively in the early 1960s) white institutions of North Carolina State (Raleigh), Duke University (Durham) and the University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill) also played significant roles in helping to change racial conceptions and defended the students' right to protest. These three universities and their respective cities comprise North Carolina's "Research Triangle." The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC) in particular had a tradition in the decades previous to the 1960s as a strong defender of academic freedom. Many professors from the Research Triangle schools were members of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), which vigorously defended the idea of academic freedom for professors. While the AAUP periodically issued resolutions on academic freedom that involved issues of race relations prior to 1960, the sit-in movement helped inspire a period in which the majority of its resolutions dealt with the issue of race and indicated the organization's support of integration. Ideals of academic freedom thus provided a theoretical foundation for the defense of the protests by not only African American students, but also some white professors and students in the region.[6]

---

[5] See survey in appendix; Carrie Gaddy Brock, interview by the author, digital recording, 2 March 2016, Raleigh; Stafford Bullock, interview by the author, digital recording, 2 March 2016, Raleigh; LaMonte Wyche, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 29 June 2016; Vivian Camm, interview by the author, digital recording, 27 April 2016, Lynchburg, Virginia.

[6] Robert MacIver, *Academic Freedom in Our Time* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), 272; Richard Hofstadter and Walter P. Metzger, *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), 446-450; Charles J. Holden, *The New Southern University: Academic Freedom and Liberalism at UNC* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2012), 44-47, 76, 84; Detroit AP, "Professors Rally to Student Aid," *News and Observer*, 10 April 1960, 8.

In a region often referred to as the Triangle, or more specifically, the Research Triangle, another sort of triangle existed in the 1960s at Shaw, Saint Augustine's and NCC, which I refer to as the "Protest Triangle." Students at these black institutions provided the most active leadership for the sit-ins and other forms of direct-action in the region. In Raleigh, students at Shaw and Saint Augustine's worked closely together and would generally meet on Shaw's campus in the heart of downtown before marching to the segregated businesses to stage protest demonstrations or sit-ins. As the first institution of higher learning founded for African Americans in the South, Shaw had a rich educational tradition. Every generation of Shaw graduates had not only symbolized black progress in education but exemplified its possibilities. But the early 1960s-era students were a special generation of activists who directly challenged a society that had limited the opportunities of its graduates for nearly a century.[7]

Students from the "Protest Triangle" schools provided the backbone of the movements to challenge segregation in Raleigh and Durham. The theme of "campus to counter" involves a double meaning. On a literal level, student activists went from the campus to the segregated lunch counters to participate in sit-ins in Raleigh and Durham. On a more figurative level, the "campus" acted as a sort of counter to established city leadership in the form of business leaders, the mayor, and the city council, as well as state government leadership. The students and most professors and administrators at these black schools recognized that white leaders would not "bestow" freedom upon them. In order to push business leaders to integrate or to challenge city, state, or even federal laws

[7] For analysis of Shaw University's history, see Wilmoth A. Carter, *Shaw's Universe: A Monument to Educational Innovation* (Raleigh: Shaw University, 1973).

to protect their civil rights, they recognized they would have to push for them through direct-action tactics.[8]

Students sought to counter the most blatant supporters of segregation and racial discrimination as well as those who characterized themselves as "moderates" on issues of race. On the local level, they challenged business and municipal leaders. In Raleigh, student protestors targeted the Ambassador Theater, which was managed by Mayor William G. Enloe. By doing so, they sought to bring forth economic and moral pressure for integration. Some student protestors viewed Enloe as "part of the status quo," unwilling to take a principled stand for integration.[9] One of the factors that made the Raleigh movement unique in the state was that the local movement intersected heavily with the statewide movement largely due to the presence of the state capital and the hotel that served as quarters for state legislators. The demonstrations at the Sir Walter Hotel represented some of the tensions between student demonstrators and state legislators, including an incident in which a legislator threatened to "slap hell out" of a UNC student protestor.[10]

Student activists in Raleigh and Durham helped bring about changes to racially discriminatory practices on the local, state, and national levels. Significant desegregation of public accommodations in both cities occurred prior to the March on Washington in August 1963, and overt segregation in restaurants, theaters, and other places of business was mostly a thing of the past prior to the signing of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. NCC

---

[8] See survey in appendix.
[9] McLouis Clayton, interview by the author, digital recording, 2 March 2016, Raleigh.
[10] Bob Lynch, "Negroes 'Sit-In' at Sir Walter," *News and Observer*, 11 June 1963, 1.

students who had been arrested for sit-ins in Durham in 1960 eventually had their convictions overturned by the U.S. Supreme Court. One of those students, John Avent, recalls that "we wanted to pressure everyone in power." While not every student sought arrest when they participated in sit-ins, Avent and those arrested at S.H. Kress in May 1960 had planned for their arrest, and welcomed the potential to challenge the convictions in the courts. He contends that the sit-in cases, including *John Thomas Avent et al, Petitioners, v. State of North Carolina* provided the "pillar of the Civil Rights Act." Indeed, the pressure placed on the Kennedy Administration by the various demonstrations, many which were led by black college students, had provided the impetus for the legislation that was ultimately signed by President Johnson in 1964.[11]

The rich historiography of the civil rights movement in the United States has only scratched the surface of the local movements in Raleigh and Durham. In general, the limited historiography of the civil rights movement in Raleigh and Durham and that of individuals that played roles in the local movements in the two cities has often fallen short in the area of addressing the student activists themselves. This is so small oversight considering that the students from the "Protest Triangle" schools were the most influential group in bringing about changes to segregation and racial discrimination in Raleigh and Durham in the early 1960s.

Leslie Brown's *Upbuilding Black Durham: Gender, Class, and Black Community Development in the Jim Crow South* offers several poignant insights into black economic

[11] John Thomas Avent, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 12 July 2016; Kenneth T. Andrews and Sarah Gaby, "Local Protest and Federal Policy: The Impact of the Civil Rights Movement on the 1964 Civil Rights Act," *Sociological Review* 30, S1 (June 2015): 509-527.

development in Durham, mostly in the first four decades of the twentieth century. She reveals the ways in which African Americans dealt with segregation and how some were able to use it to their advantage. She maintains, "Nationally, black Durham was viewed as a symbol of what African Americans could do on their own when left alone by whites."[12] She addresses the important role of black businesses in Durham, including the development of the North Carolina Mutual and Life Insurance Company, which became the largest black-owned business in the world by the mid-1920s. Brown argues that "Durham's black elite emerged within an apartheid system enforced routinely by violence and learned to use segregation to its advantage, believing it could provide a route to autonomy otherwise denied by Jim Crow."[13] In 1925, the famous black sociologist E. Franklin Frazier dubbed Durham the "Capital of the Black Middle Class." But Brown is careful to point out that the veneer of Durham as a thriving place for African American business contrasted with the poverty that existed in the city's black neighborhoods, particularly among single black women.[14]

Perhaps the most significant scholarly work on the civil rights era in Durham is Christina Greene's *Our Separate Ways: Women and the Black Freedom Movement in Durham, North Carolina*, although only one chapter directly addresses the direct-action phase that I address in this work. She analyzes some of the civil rights organizing that occurred in Durham prior to the sit-in movement, including the efforts to revitalize the NAACP in Durham by Shaw graduates R. Arline Young and Ella Baker. Greene

---

[12] Leslie Brown, *Upbuilding Black Durham: Gender, Class, and Black Community Development in the Jim Crow South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 14.
[13] Brown, *Upbuilding Black Durham*, 114.
[14] Brown, *Upbuilding Black Durham*, 252.

emphasizes the crucial role that women played in organizing and participating in civil rights demonstrations. She points out that at the outbreak of the sit-ins and other forms of protest in 1960, the local NAACP had a majority female membership, and that women appeared to have outnumbered men at many of the demonstrations. In addition, NCC student Guytana Horton was president of the statewide NAACP intercollegiate division in the early 1960s. Yet she acknowledges that sexism existed in the movement, and that men spoke more than women at mass meetings. The interviews that I have conducted largely reinforce Greene's assertion that women were often the majority at the protests. When asked which percentage of the demonstrators were women, student interviewees from the "Protest Triangle" schools generally responded with either numbers or statements that implied about half or more were women.[15]

The existing historiography on the civil rights movement in Raleigh is sparse and does not sufficiently address student leadership from Shaw or Saint Augustine's. Historian Peter Ling points out that David Forbes was one example of an activist who "lack[s] a profile in movement studies."[16] Like other activists in Raleigh, Forbes receives occasional mentions for his role in the founding of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) in 1960, but scholars have scarcely addressed his role, or that of other movement leaders who attended Shaw such as Albert Sampson and Mack Sowell in bringing about desegregation in Raleigh. Forbes was one of the most dynamic

---

[15] Christina Greene, *Our Separate Ways: Women and the Black Freedom Movement in Durham, North Carolina* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 11, 21, 25; See list of interviews in bibliography. Only two of the student respondents gave a number or phrase that implied that women represented less than half of the demonstrators.

[16] Peter Ling, "Not One Committee, But Several," in Iwan Morgan and Philip Davies, eds., *From Sit-Ins to SNCC: The Student Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida), 89.

leaders of the student protest movement in the city and was among the first group of students arrested for trespassing at Cameron Village in Raleigh on February 12, 1960.[17] He had already established himself as a leader of the local movement prior to his involvement in the Youth Leadership Conference at Shaw in April 1960. Rev. Dr. Wyatt Tee Walker, a close confidant of Martin Luther King, Jr. had previously met Forbes at a minister's conference. When Walker came to Shaw for the conference in the spring of 1960, he was not surprised to find that the articulate young student from Raleigh was a leader of the movement to dismantle segregation in the city.[18]

Shaw University was at the heart of civil rights activism in Raleigh during the sit-in movement in 1960, and for three days in April 1960, it served as the epicenter of civil rights organizing on a region-wide level. The historic Youth Leadership Conference organized by the Southern Leadership Conference (SCLC) played a significant role in the growing civil rights movement. The conference and ensuing conferences in Atlanta ultimately led to the development of SNCC. Much of the scholarly attention given to the conference has focused on the development of SNCC or on the apparent strategic differences between Martin Luther King, Jr. and Ella Baker. In *Ella Baker and the Black Freedom Movement: A Radical, Democratic Vision*, Barbara Ransby describes some of the sources of tensions and disagreements about strategy between Baker and King. According to Ransby, Baker wanted to "preserve the brazen fighting spirit the students had exhibited in their sit-in protests. She did not want them to be shackled by the

[17] Charles Craven, "Police Arrest 41 in Raleigh Demonstrations: Trespassing is Charged in Village," *News and Observer*, 13 February 1960, 1.
[18] Wyatt Tee Walker, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 15 July 2017.

bureaucracy of existing organizations."[19] Ransby also addresses the impact that Baker had on Diane Nash, who had already demonstrated her own leadership in the Nashville movement. But Ransby's work does not directly address the experiences at the conference of North Carolina's student activists. Thus, this work will address the experiences of Shaw students and other students from North Carolina, in addition to examining the perceptions of the conference among "Protest Triangle" students who did not attend the Easter weekend conference.

This work will also engage with the historiography related to whites who were involved in the civil rights movement. The extensive use of student interviews in addition to archival research contributes to my emphasis on investigating the connections between black student activists and those whites who supported their cause in the Triangle. Perhaps the most consistent white supporter of African American civil rights and opportunities in the Triangle was Rev. W.W. Finlator. G. McLeod Bryan's *Dissenter in the Baptist Southland: Fifty Years in the Career of William Wallace Finlator* demonstrates that Finlator took principled stands against racial discrimination even before becoming the pastor at Pullen Memorial Baptist Church in Raleigh in the mid-1950s. In April 1942, Finlator wrote an article for the *Biblical Recorder* in which he questioned whether Americans were practicing Hitler's racism. He also urged southern churches not to ignore the implications of Gunnar Myrdal's study on race relations, *An American Dilemma*.[20]

---

[19] Barbara Ransby, *Ella Baker and the Black Freedom Movement: A Radical Democratic Vision* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 244.
[20] G. McLeod Bryan, *Dissenter in the Baptist Southland: Fifty Years in the Career of William Wallace Finlator* (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1985), 94-95.

Finlator's advocacy of social justice was exhibited in full color in the wake of the sit-ins in Raleigh and also demonstrated his connections to Shaw University. The preacher taught classes at Shaw from 1956-1960 and established a friendship with Shaw's Dean of Religion, Dr. Grady Davis. Dean Foster Payne of Shaw commended Finlator for publicly supporting the student sit-ins. In 1962, Finlator gave a speech on the Shaw campus, in which he argued that instead of arresting students for wanting to buy a hamburger, public officials should padlock public eating establishments that refused to serve blacks.[21] Finlator's stance in this regard seemed to foreshadow one of the pillars of the Civil Rights Act, which prohibited racial discrimination in public accommodations. His support for integration demonstrated that he was progressive on race issues. His support of the tactics of the demonstrators made other whites view him as a radical. To support integration was one thing, but to defend the tactics of the demonstrators to directly challenge unjust laws and social practices demonstrated his commitment to social justice. One survey in 1961 showed that 84 percent of white southerners opposed the tactics of the sit-ins, and even among those who supported integration, only 34 percent approved of sit-ins.[22] While some whites in Raleigh supported integration, Finlator took a leadership role in pointing out that segregation was unjust and that tactics to challenge it were justified. Student activists took notice, and in my survey that asked students to rate individuals on their contributions to improving race relations and opportunities for African Americans on a scale of 1-10, the average for Finlator was 9.5.[23]

---

[21] Bryan, *Dissenter in the Baptist Southland*, 101-103.
[22] Morgan and Davies, eds., *From Sit-Ins to SNCC*, 58.
[23] See survey in appendix.

Allard Lowenstein was another white liberal who took a strong leadership role in dismantling segregation in Raleigh. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. argues that Lowenstein "was the supreme agitator of his day… a man who touched the consciences of his fellow citizens, educated their sensibilities, and drew forth their capacity for humane action."[24] Lowenstein's contributions to the civil rights movement have been addressed by scholars, but little attention has been given to his interactions with activists in Raleigh, aside from his involvement in an incident in 1963 in which he entered the Sir Walter Café with Angie Brooks, who was a Shaw graduate and Liberian Ambassador to the UN. The group, which included Shaw student Joseph Outland, was denied service, leading the U.S. State Department to issue an official apology to Brooks.[25] From 1962 to 1963, Lowenstein taught social studies at North Carolina State University and became heavily involved with the protest demonstrations in Raleigh and interacted with Shaw and Saint Augustine's students. Shaw student protest leader Mack Sowell recalls that he and other students visited Lowenstein at his apartment.[26] Ultimately, Lowenstein was representative of the connections between the "Protest Triangle" schools and the Research Triangle schools, a connection that increased during the protest demonstrations in 1963.

While this study focuses mainly on Raleigh and Durham, it will also place the local movements in the broader context of the civil rights movement in North Carolina and the nation in general. William H. Chafe's *Civilities and Civil Rights* remains one of

---

[24] Gregory Stone and Douglas Lowenstein, eds., *Lowenstein: Acts of Courage and Belief* (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers, 1983), xx.
[25] "Seeks Meal: UN Official Turned Away," *News and Observer*, 1 May 1963, 1; "US Agency Apologizes for Incident Here," *News and Observer*, 2 May 1963, 1.
[26] Mack Sowell, interview by the author, digital recording, 20 April 2016, Raleigh.

the most crucial works for understanding race relations in North Carolina in the civil rights era. Chafe points out that despite the state's reputation for progressivism in comparison to other southern states, much of the evidence demonstrated otherwise. He argues that "North Carolina represented a paradox: it combined a reputation for enlightenment and a social reality that was reactionary."[27] Chafe emphasizes that civility played a role in shaping white North Carolinians' approach to race relations. "Civility is the cornerstone of the progressive mystique…Civility was what white progressivism was all about—a way of dealing with people and problems that made good manners more important than substantial action."[28]

While Chafe's arguments apply broadly to North Carolina and more specifically to his research on Greensboro, there were expressions among local and state political leaders in Raleigh that lend credence to his assessments. For example, in the wake of the sit-ins, Mayor William G. Enloe remarked that it was "regrettable that some of our young Negro students would risk endangering…race relations by seeking to change a long-standing custom in a manner that was all but destined to fail."[29] My research and analysis makes clear that the black students indeed were seeking to endanger existing race relations. They sought to destroy a social system, often supported by local and state politicians, which operated on paternalism, discrimination, and the denial of economic opportunities and expressions of first-class citizenship for African Americans.

---

[27] William H. Chafe, *Civilities and Civil Rights: Greensboro, North Carolina, and the Black Struggle for Freedom* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), 5.
[28] Chafe, *Civilities and Civil Rights*, 8.
[29] Charles Craven and David Cooper, "Student Sitdown Strike Spreads to Stores Here," *News and Observer*, 11 February 1960, 1.

The experiences of student activists and their recollections of that period demonstrate that Raleigh was conflicted between the past and the possibilities of the future. Forbes characterized Raleigh in the early 1960s as a "politely racist city."[30] Wyatt Walker, who had participated in the direct-action campaigns in Petersburg, Virginia, in 1960 and participated in the Youth Leadership Conference at Shaw in April of that year, recalled that the resistance to the movement appeared more intense in Petersburg than in Raleigh. But he also pointed out that Raleigh was like a lot of other southern cities at that time, as it was "trying to be graceful in a time of change."[31] But unlike many of the so-called white moderate politicians throughout the state, the student activists were more concerned with change than the perceived grace of a segregated city.

Through the use of oral history, this study seeks not only to include the voices of civil rights participants, but to highlight them. The purpose is not merely to reveal the experiences of the mostly unheralded local civil rights activists, but to analyze their importance to a movement for which they helped to foster and sustain. This study incorporates twenty-nine interviews conducted by the author, mostly with civil rights activists in Raleigh and Durham in the early 1960s. I have sought to incorporate their experiences as well as their perceptions of the movement into my analysis. Their recollections and insightful anecdotes are a vivid reminder of the human aspect of history. In addition to exposing some of the most unique, painful and beautiful stories in the challenges to segregation, this work also aims to portray a more systematic approach to history through the use of surveys. Interviewees' responses to the survey questions

[30] David Forbes, interview by the author.
[31] Wyatt Tee Walker, interview by the author.

allow for a more careful presentation of arguments and allow the author to make assertions based upon common experiences among those who created historical change.

Student activists in the "Protest Triangle" forced local, state, and national leaders to confront the evils of segregation. It is the purpose of this study to examine their experiences and put them in the forefront of the analysis of the historical change they inspired. They garnered and even mobilized many allies for social justice along the way, including the advocates of academic freedom at the Triangle's black and white colleges. In a segregated society that denied them full opportunities, they realized that dismantling segregation was a step toward employing their full potential. Thus, the special generation of student civil rights activists in the early 1960s recognized their involvement in civil rights protests as part of their education and perceived efforts to thwart the demonstrations as challenges to academic freedom. In response to an interview question which asked what role academic freedom played in the movement, Mack Sowell responded, "Probably half has never been told about that."[32] And so in the pages that follow, it shall be told in all its complexity, anguish, and beauty.

[32] Mack Sowell, interview by the author.

CHAPTER II

EDUCATION, ACTIVISM, AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM IN HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Education played a crucial role in paving the winding and unfinished road to black freedom in North Carolina. African Americans since the Civil War have recognized the connection between educational improvements and economic opportunities for people of their race. In 1865, the *Journal of Freedom*, a pro-black journal published in Raleigh, declared, "The Freeman has a disease of learning. It is a mania with him."[1] No other institution in North Carolina was more representative of the connections between education and opportunities for African Americans than Shaw University in Raleigh. Through its many changes since its founding in 1865, the school has served as a propagator of talent, leadership, and activism in North Carolina.

Shaw fostered the development of a sometimes thriving, but always striving, group of educated African Americans who recognized the importance of education in bringing about increased opportunities in society. Shaw graduates made significant contributions to the development of black higher education throughout the state, which became a driving force for further advancement of opportunities in the area of education, business, religion, medicine, and even politics. Shaw graduates and those they influenced were involved in the consistent efforts to improve opportunities for their race and also the

[1] David Perkins, ed., *The News and Observer's Raleigh: A Living History of North Carolina's Capital* (Winston-Salem: John F. Blair, 1994), 83.

intermittent challenges to segregation that preceded the height of the civil rights movement in the 1960s.

The institution that became known as Shaw University was the first historically black college in the South. The school was part of a sub-region of the South that became a center for black higher education, much as the region was a center for white higher education. By the mid- twentieth century, the three cities that make up the Triangle (Raleigh, Durham, Chapel Hill) housed the oldest private black university in the South (Shaw) in addition to another that was founded in 1868 (Saint Augustine's College), the first public school in the nation to graduate students (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill [UNC]), the nation's first state-supported liberal arts college for blacks (North Carolina College for Negroes), and what became perhaps the most prestigious private university in the South (Duke University). Quite simply, the Triangle was the heart of higher education in the South for much of the late-nineteenth and twentieth centuries.[2]

While there was limited interaction among students and faculty between the black and white colleges in the region, internal developments at the white colleges in the early- to mid-twentieth century portended the more direct challenges to segregation by white university faculty and students in the region in the early 1960s. There were several instances in which principles of academic freedom were utilized to justify discussion of race relations in a more reasonable and less emotional manner. This trend was especially

[2] Earle E. Thorpe, *A Concise History of North Carolina Central University* (Durham: Harrington Publications, 1984), 73; Arnold L. King, *The Multicampus University of North Carolina Comes of Age, 1956-1986* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina, 1987), xi; Clara Barnes Jenkins, "An Historical Study of Shaw University, 1865-1963" (Ph.D. diss., University of Pittsburgh, 1965), 8.

true at UNC and Duke, two institutions that were among the leading southern advocates of academic freedom. While academic freedom did not necessarily entail progressive ideas on race relations or advocacy of desegregation, it did help those who studied race relations share their findings and ideas even when those ideas were critical of Jim Crow.[3] In a region that often stifled meaningful debate on race relations through legal and social means, the ability to speak critically of segregation and discrimination, within limits, was no small development on the road to exposing the evils of segregation.

The school that ultimately became Shaw University was founded in Raleigh in December 1865 by white former Union Army Chaplain Dr. Henry Martin Tupper in a city that the *Daily Progress* newspaper claimed was a "seething, rushing, boiling cauldron…the streets being entirely filled with soldiers, negroes, men and women, and strangers from the four quarters."[4] After being asked by the American Baptist Home Mission Society to take up missionary work to assist blacks, Tupper organized a theology class at the Old Guion Hotel in Raleigh. Many African Americans sought educational opportunities in the city. The school was initially named the Raleigh Institute and was the first African American institution of higher learning in the South. By 1867, the school consisted of three buildings, two which were antebellum cabins. Both Tupper and Elijah Shaw, the benefactor for which the school was renamed in 1870, were white missionaries from Massachusetts. The early development of what became Shaw University was representative of the important role that northern white missionaries

---

[3] Charles Holden, *The New Southern University: Academic Freedom and Liberalism at UNC* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2012), 22, 44-47, 76; James LeLoudis, *Schooling the New South: Pedagogy, Self, and Society in North Carolina, 1880-1920* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 184.

[4] Perkins, ed., *The News and Observer's Raleigh*, 83.

played in developing black educational institutions in the South in the Reconstruction era.[5]

Shaw University was a trailblazer in black education in many respects. In 1870, the school admitted its first boarding female students and thus became the first African American institution in America to open its doors to women. Dr. Wilmoth Carter, the social sciences professor who supported student civil rights activists in the 1960s, maintains that the school stands as a landmark in the higher education of African Americans. According to Carter, "From a national perspective the history of Shaw University replicates the development and growth of Negro higher education, while regionally it parallels the emergence of the 'New South' in which educational rehabilitation became a major goal."[6]

The establishment of schools for African Americans in the South represented perhaps the greatest challenge to Southern society, which had directly restricted the education of African Americans during the slavery era. It involved the support of Northern missionaries as well as federal programs established in the Reconstruction era. For instance, Saint Augustine's Normal School (Saint Augustine's University today) was established in 1867 with cooperation between the Episcopal Church and the Freedmen's Bureau, a federal program which had as one of its aims the education of freed slaves. Like Carter, fellow 1960s-era Shaw professor Charles Robson understood the historical importance of African Americans who sought education in the post-Civil War era.

---

[5] Hugh Victor Brown, *A History of the Education of Negroes in North Carolina* (Raleigh: Irving Swain Press, Inc., 1961), 19, 25, 67.
[6] Wilmoth A. Carter, *Shaw's Universe: A Monument to Educational Innovation* (Raleigh: Shaw University, 1973), iii, v.

According to Robson, "Education became synonymous with freedom for the ex-slaves to whom, in the ante-bellum days, any education had been forbidden."[7] Raleigh was not unique in the South in terms of the excitement that many former slaves shared for educational opportunities. But Raleigh was unique in that it had two burgeoning institutions of higher learning in Shaw and Saint Augustine's while many cities in the state and throughout the South did not yet have one such institution in the years immediately following the Civil War. But where educational opportunities existed for former slaves, they connected those opportunities to a rejection of their enslaved past. In an analysis similar to that of Robson, historian Steven Hahn asserts, "Freed people clamored for schooling because they viewed it simultaneously as a rejection of their enslaved past and as a means of self-respect in the post-emancipation world."[8]

As opportunities for African Americans to pursue higher education expanded, so did political opportunities, and the footprint of Shaw was felt in politics. While North Carolina did not send any blacks to the U.S. Senate in the nineteenth century, four African Americans were elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1875, 1883, 1889, and 1897. All four represented North Carolina's Second District, a district mostly east of Raleigh, which was often referred to as the "Black Second" due to its predominantly black population. One of the four, Henry P. Cheatham, who was born into slavery and served in the U.S. Congress from 1889 to 1893, was an 1883 graduate of Shaw University. The fact that a former slave rose to the highest lawmaking body in the

---

[7] Brown, *A History of the Education of Negroes in North Carolina*, 27; Glenford E. Mitchell and William H. Peace III, eds., *The Angry Black South* (New York: Corinth Books, 1962), 13.
[8] Steven Hahn, *A Nation Under Our Feet: Black Political Struggles in the Rural South from Slavery to the Great Migration* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003), 277.

nation was remarkable. The reality that political opportunities for African Americans in the South did not improve on a gradually ascending line from the Civil War to the present is evident in the stark reality that a black man who fought in the Civil War had a greater chance of becoming a Southern congressman than did a black man who fought in World War I or World War II. While formal black political power waned throughout much of the South toward the end of the nineteenth century largely due to state laws that effectively disfranchised many African Americans, in the 1890s in North Carolina, Populist-Republican fusion tickets enjoyed some success, including the election of a Republican governor in 1896.[9]

Nonetheless, the 1890s was a period of consistent violence toward African Americans throughout much of the South. In the period between 1890 and 1917, approximately two to three black southerners were lynched per week. Whites often justified lynching as a way to protect Southern women from rape by black men. Historian Leon Litwack asserts, "To endorse lynching was to dwell on the sexual depravity of blacks, to raise the specter of the black beast seized by uncontrollable savage sexual passions that were inherent to the race [in the mind of a racist white]."[10] But rape was overblown as a reason for lynching. As Litwack points out, less than 20 percent of the nearly three thousand blacks known to have been lynched in the period from 1889-1918 were *accused* of rape. He points out that some lynchings took place for the sole reason of punishing a black man for achieving economic success. Many lynchings and

---

[9] "Henry Plummer Cheatham," Biographical Directory of the United States Congress, http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=C000340 (Accessed July 22, 2017); Hahn, *A Nation Under Our Feet*, 437.

[10] Leon Litwack, *Trouble in Mind: Black Southerners in the Age of Jim Crow* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998), 284, 302.

instances of violence toward African Americans had political or economic motivations. In the 1920s, Walter White, a prominent figure in the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) who investigated lynching, concluded, "Lynching is much more an expression of Southern fear of Negro progress than of Negro crime."[11]

The violent response among some whites to African American involvement in politics was manifest during the Wilmington Massacre and coup d'état in 1898. In a general sense, the violence in Wilmington that year was a white supremacist reaction to the political power wielded by Republicans, largely but not exclusively due to the strong base of African American supporters. Tensions had risen in the city during the summer when Rebecca Felton visited the city. Felton was a Progressive-era reformer who ultimately became a leading advocate of woman's suffrage. But the former slave owner was a staunch white supremacist and defender of the lynching of black men accused of rape. During her visit in Wilmington, she rallied against interracial relations between black men and white women. In response, Alexander Manly, the black editor of the *Wilmington Daily Record*, wrote an editorial that discussed the taboo subject of interracial sex. Manly boldly wrote, "Our experiences among poor white people in the country teaches us that women of that race are not any more particular in the matter of clandestine meetings with colored men than the white men with the colored women." He pointed out the double-standard that had characterized the South for so long in regards to interracial sex, which often viewed sex between a white man and black woman as

[11] Litwack, *Trouble in Mind*, 309, 320.

immoral but defensible, while sex between a black man and a white woman was considered by many Southern whites as rape, even when the act was consensual. Manly criticized the hypocrisy of Felton and other white supremacists, and he argued that whites "cry aloud for the virtue of your women while you seek to destroy the morality of ours. Don't ever think that your women will remain pure while you are debauching ours."[12]

Democratic newspapers throughout the state, including the *Raleigh News and Observer* publicized Manly's editorial and pointed out the boldest assertions in capital letters. Newspapers and Democratic Party leaders utilized the Manly editorial as a method of increasing the racial hysteria that surrounded the 1898 elections in Wilmington and other places in North Carolina. Nonetheless, the Fusionists were successful in the November elections in Wilmington. They won the mayor's office and control of the city council. Despite the fact that two-thirds of the council members were white, white supremacists in the city viewed the results as an example of "Negro domination." The day after the election, white Democrats seized the government of Wilmington in what was quite simply a coup d'état. A white mob burned the building that housed Manly's *Daily Record*, and the black editor was forced to flee the city. After white supremacists terrorized and killed at least fourteen African Americans in the city, hundreds of African Americans fled the city. Historian Leslie Brown avers, "The Wilmington Riot revealed

[12] Litwack, *Trouble in Mind*, 282-283; Leslie Brown, *Upbuilding Black Durham: Gender, Class, and Black Community Development in the Jim Crow South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 61, 62; Alexander Manly editorial, *Wilmington Daily Record*, August 18, 1898, "The Wilmington Record Editorial," http://www.learnnc.org/lp/editions/nchist-newsouth/4363 (accessed June 25, 2017).

not only whites' determination to forge disorder and to deny African Americans rights, but also their willingness to compromise democracy by violence."[13]

The events in Wilmington were both unique and emblematic of racial politics in the South. The takeover of the government in Wilmington through a coup d'état remains unmatched in American history. But the events were also emblematic of the solidification of the power of white supremacy in politics in North Carolina and throughout the South. The Wilmington Riot demonstrated that even in cities with heavy African American populations, white supremacy was a winning strategy, whether obtained through legal political means or through the use of intimidation and politically motivated violence. The era of Fusion politics in North Carolina died in the late 1890s. Historian Adam Fairclough asserts, "Fusion might have prevented the South's descent into oligarchy and one-party rule by upholding black voting rights and fostering multiparty competition…But Fusion was never given a fair test. The Democrats countered the emerging black-poor white alliance by unfurling the banner of white supremacy."[14]

At the turn of the twentieth century, more systematic methods were introduced to disfranchise African Americans in North Carolina. In 1899, the General Assembly followed the examples set forth in previous years by the state legislatures in Mississippi, South Carolina, and Louisiana, which aimed for the total disfranchisement of black voters. Legislators passed an amendment to the state constitution in 1900, which

---

[13] Brown, *Upbuilding Black Durham*, 63, 79; Adam Fairclough, *Better Day Coming: Blacks and Equality, 1890-2000* (New York: Penguin Books, 2002), 8-10.
[14] Fairclough, *Better Day Coming*, 8.

included voting restrictions via poll taxes and literacy tests, combined with grandfather clauses to ensure that African Americans could not vote. In the state that had elected more black officials than any other state in the South, the opportunity for the election of black officials became nearly nonexistent in the early part of the twentieth century. George Henry White, the last black congressman from the South until the election of Andrew Young (Georgia) and Barbara Jordan (Texas) in 1972, stated in 1901 that "at no time in the history of our freedom has the effort been made to mold public sentiment against us and our progress so strongly as is now being done…I can no longer live in North Carolina and be a man."[15] It was in the context of political disfranchisement of African Americans that segregation was strengthened throughout the South. The 1896 Supreme Court decision in *Plessy v. Ferguson*, which gave sanction to the doctrine of "separate but equal," reinforced the reality that the federal government could no longer be considered a legitimate ally to the rights of African Americans.

Various newspapers supported the solidification of white supremacy and segregation in North Carolina. The experiences and mentality of Josephus Daniels, the editor of the *News and Observer*, offer a window into some of the forces that shaped race relations in the South around the turn of the twentieth century. During the brief period of fusionist rule in Wake County (1894-1898), a legislator introduced a bill to make representation on the Board of Alderman in Raleigh more equitable. The *News and Observer* characterized it as a measure to "Negroize Raleigh." Daniels supported the white supremacist campaigns in various cities in the late 1890s, most notably that in

[15] Fairclough, *Better Day Coming*, 7, 10, 17.

Wilmington in 1898. In 1941, Daniels reflected that he had been a product of an era that was "torn between forces of progress and reaction." Like many who supported racial segregation, Daniels also supported Progressive-era reforms such as child labor laws, public education, prohibition, and woman's suffrage.[16] Indeed, some whites justified racial segregation as a Progressive reform. At the heart of Progressivism lay a tendency to believe that laws could be used to create a more orderly society. As historian Leon Litwack points out, "Caught in the age of Progressive reform, some whites preferred to view the restrictions on blacks as reform, not oppression, as a way to use the law to contain both races, resolve racial tension, and maintain the social order."[17]

In the face of disfranchisement and segregation, African Americans in Raleigh and Durham continued to push for improved opportunities for their race. Shaw University graduate and Durham businessman and educator James E. Shepard urged fellow blacks in 1903 not to be discouraged by the recent worsening of conditions in the state. "Citizenship is not in constitutions but in the mind. My mind, my soul, and my virtue are ever free."[18] As historian James LeLoudis points out, black Southerners adapted a subtle strategy to confront the harsh realities of race relations in the early twentieth century, one that "acknowledged the reality of white rule but at the same time searched the crevices of white supremacy for every opportunity for black power and self-determination."[19]

---

[16] Perkins, ed., *The News and Observer's Raleigh*, 119.
[17] Litwack, *Trouble in Mind*, 227.
[18] James E. Shepard, "Message to the Negro Race," *Charlotte Observer*, 8 November 1903; LeLoudis, *Schooling the New South*, 180.
[19] LeLoudis, *Schooling the New South*, 180.

For Shepard, the path toward freedom remained rooted in education. His training as a pharmacist had opened an opportunity to establish a drugstore in Durham. Shepard's most enduring legacy was his establishment of the National Religious Training School and Chautauqua on land donated by white citizens in Durham in 1910. The school grew quickly, and by 1912, there were ten buildings valued at $125,000. By 1923, the state legislature purchased the school and renamed it the Durham State Normal School, which emphasized teacher training. Ultimately, the school became the first publicly funded liberal arts college in the South and was known as the North Carolina College at Durham during the period of mass civil rights demonstrations in the city in the early 1960s. Like students at his alma mater, students from the institution that Shepard founded would become heavily involved in bringing about integration to the Triangle in 1960s. Shepard was among many Shaw graduates who played a critical role in the development of African American higher education in the state, joining a list that included Peter W. Moore, the first principal of the State Colored Normal School at Elizabeth City (Elizabeth City State University today); and Ezekiel Ezra Smith, a critical figure in the development of the Fayetteville State Normal School (Fayetteville State University today).[20]

Shepard was part of a thriving black middle class in Durham. The 1920s are often conceptualized as seeing the emergence of a "New Negro," a term that was not unique to that decade but was popularized by Harvard educated writer Alain Locke in his 1925 edited collection *The New Negro*. The phrase has various interpretations, but at the heart of the concept is an increased assertiveness and sense of race pride, one that can be seen

[20] Carter, *Shaw's Universe*, 50; Brown, *A History of the Education of Negroes in North Carolina*, 970; Jenkins, "An Historical Study of Shaw University, 1865-1963," 117.

in the writings and other art forms of the Harlem Renaissance. But in Durham, black assertiveness and confidence was most forcefully expressed in an economic sense. As Leslie Brown points out, "Harlem may have been the hub of black creative and cultural life, but Durham was the epicenter of its business life."[21] The famous black sociologist E. Franklin Frazier called Durham the "capital of the black middle class," and noted that "Durham offers none of the color and creative life we find among Negroes in New York City. It is not a place where men write and dream; but a place where black men calculate and work."[22]

No other business represented black economic power in Durham more fully than the North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Company. Dr. Aaron M. Moore, an 1888 graduate of the Medical School at Shaw University, was among its three founders. By the 1920s, North Carolina Mutual had grown into the largest black-owned financial institution in the nation.[23] Many of the leading black businessmen in Durham and other cities did not directly challenge segregation during this period. According to Carter, "The Negro middle class of the South during this period was too busy building its separate world of business, schools, educated children, fraternal and social life, and perpetuating its academic seclusion and its intra-racial social status to destroy its handiwork by demanding an openly integrated world."[24]

---

[21] Brown, *Upbuilding Black Durham*, 122.
[22] Brown, *Upbuilding Black Durham*, 14; Andre D. Vann and Beverly Washington Jones, *Durham's Hayti* (Arcadia Publishing, 1999), 9.
[23] Christina Greene, *Our Separate Ways: Women and the Black Freedom Movement in Durham, North Carolina* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 1.
[24] Wilmoth A. Carter, *The New Negro of the South: A Portrait of Movements and Leadership* (New York: Exposition Press, 1967), 48.

Despite the limits segregation placed on African Americans, many black Durhamites adapted the circumstances to their advantage. The black elite in the city were both admired and criticized by other blacks. Black citizens sometimes accused the black elite in Durham of being agreeable to segregation for their own economic benefit. Leslie Brown asserts that "Durham's black leaders were accused of accommodating segregation. And they did—but not as a capitulation to racism. Rather they viewed upbuilding in the segregated South as a tactic of resistance and as a strategy to outwit Jim Crow."[25]

There was a palpable pride that existed in the black section of Durham, known as Hayti. In 1920, W.E.B DuBois wrote, "There is in this small city a group of five thousand or more colored people, whose social and economic development is perhaps more striking than that of any similar group in the nation."[26] In addition to the economic prowess of the black elite in Hayti, a vibrant music scene developed where musicians such as Bessie Smith and Count Basie entertained at the Biltmore Hotel. Earl E. Thorpe, who eventually became the first student at North Carolina College to earn a Ph.D. in history, and was a faculty member at the school in the period of the sit-in movement, recalled that "Hayti was a symbol of Black aliveness, achievement, activity, and creativity—of Black civilization if you will."[27]

In Raleigh, the heart of black business operated on East Hargett Street near the black neighborhoods in the southern and eastern part of the city. According to Carter,

---

[25] Brown, *Upbuilding Black Durham*, 19.
[26] Vann, *Durham's Hayti*, 7.
[27] Vann, *Durham's Hayti*, 8; Earl E. Thorpe, *A Concise History of North Carolina Central University* (Durham: Harrington Publications, 1984), 76.

Hargett Street contained fifty-one black and twenty-seven white businesses in 1940. In 1959, on the eve of the sit-in movement in the city, there were forty-six black and twenty-three white businesses on the street. One of the most important businesses on Hargett Street was the Mechanics and Farmers Bank, which branched out from its roots in Durham and had become one of the largest black-owned banks in the country. Entertainment options were somewhat limited, but one of the central points was the Lightner Arcade Building, which housed the only hotel for African Americans in the city. The hotel was considered one of the premier hotels between New York City and Atlanta. Like the Biltmore in Durham, the hotel was a hub of social activity, including dances and performances by musicians such as Count Basie.[28]

Despite the examples of vibrant social scenes and economic prosperity among some blacks in Raleigh and Durham, segregation also limited their opportunities. Audrey Wall, who grew up in East Raleigh, recalled that blacks could go to the white-owned shops on Fayetteville Street and purchase a dress or a hat but could not try them on. Essentially, once a black citizen left the black section of the city, they became second-class consumers. Segregation limited their purchasing options if they sought to maintain their dignity in the face of discriminatory practices. It also limited their mobility. Wall recalled that her family travelled to Nashville and "there wasn't a place we could stop in a blizzard."[29]

One resident of Raleigh recalled two experiences in which she felt the sting of segregation. Vivian E. Irving's family owned a printing company, and after operating in

[28] Perkins, ed., *The News and Observer's Raleigh*, 131.
[29] Perkins, ed., *The News and Observer's Raleigh*, 133.

a building on the corner of East Hargett and Blount Street for three months, they were notified they had to leave the building. The white owner had left it in his will that no "colored" business would operate in the building. She also recalled that when she was a child, her parents would take her down to the Capitol to feed pigeons. At the courthouse where the family stopped for a drink of water, she and her siblings used the colored water fountain. On the way home, they would ride the bus and be forced to sit in the back. In a single day, a child in the segregated South could experience the restrictions that segregation placed on their lives. Feeding pigeons on the lawn in front of the Capitol on a sunny day could very well bring a sense of freedom, a harsh juxtaposition against a building that was the symbol of a repressive government that had largely disfranchised African Americans. The same young girl who fed pigeons in the 1920s and 1930s would ultimately become the first black women to join the League of Women Voters in Raleigh in 1955. In the 1960s, she joined with student protestors from Shaw University and Saint Augustine's College as they marched up and down Fayetteville Street, with Shaw to their rear and the state capitol on the horizon.[30]

Just as segregation limited the literal mobility of African Americans, it also limited their opportunities for economic mobility. Despite the success of the black elite in Durham for much of the first half of the twentieth century, not all African Americans in the city prospered. For those who worked for white employers, there was always the concern that if economic troubles came, blacks would be the first to lose their jobs. Single black women were especially susceptible to poverty, facing both gender and race

[30] "Let Us March On," (Raleigh: Raleigh City Museum, 2000), 15-16.

discrimination in employment and wages. Durham ran the full spectrum of class, from those who lived in deep poverty to some of the wealthiest African Americans in the country. As Brown points out, "Whatever the black elite accomplished in Durham, it was rendered inadequate by the lives that black people had to live in the hollows and alleys of Durham's black neighborhoods."[31]

Despite some of the restrictions that segregation placed on the lives of African Americans, efforts at integration were not always at the forefront of black activism in the first half of the twentieth century. Many African American leaders emphasized education and creating economic opportunities within the confines of a segregated society. Carter's study of Jim Crow-era Raleigh revealed that many African Americans in the decades prior to the sit-in movement were not focused on dismantling segregation, but rather on supporting black education, patronizing black businesses, and achieving fairer pay. For instance, a black maintenance worker at North Carolina State College stated that "the colored ain't got but one real business street and that's Hargett. Negroes ought to use that street and patronize what's there." The man told of how a white man who held the same job as him made more money, despite the fact that the white co-worker took many more breaks than he. He asked his boss for an explanation, and the boss evidently responded that it took more money for a white man to live because he had to pay a maid. The black man concluded, "But that's why I say the colored got to try to help theirselves." A black housewife in Raleigh worried that "we just don't patronize each

[31] Brown, *Upbuilding Black Durham*, 253, 255.

other enough…we just have to learn that to be a race we must stick together and patronize each other and stop being jealous of one another."[32]

Yet another interviewee who worked for a railroad company believed that "sometimes you have to use both colored and white. You can't break down discrimination if you use Negroes only. We got to let the white man know he can't get along without us and we can't get along without him." Another respondent identified as a college teacher (and thus likely from Shaw or Saint Augustine's) argued that white businesses should not discriminate in their hiring practices, but also believed that "I don't think white people should be discriminated against in any business managed by Negroes, or one operated in a colored business district."[33] The interview responses demonstrate that there was no unified view about how African Americans should approach segregation. In the middle of the twentieth century, there were certainly those who were skeptical of the wisdom of seeking integration. Part of what made the sit-in movement in Raleigh and Durham and other cities in North Carolina in the early 1960s so remarkable was that student protestors and other activists were able to mobilize African American support for integration in a way not seen before.

Direct challenges to segregation were not a new phenomenon in the 1950s or 1960s. In Louisville, Kentucky, in 1871, three black men sat in the white section of one of the city's streetcars. After being thrown off the streetcar, the men returned. They were ultimately arrested and found guilty of disorderly conduct, but they appealed to a

---

[32] Wilmoth A. Carter, *The Urban Negro in the South* (New York: Vantage Press, Inc., 1961), 196.
[33] Carter, *The Urban Negro in the South*, 193, 194. The interviews are undated but appear to be from the 1950s.

federal court, which reversed the decision. The streetcar company defied the ruling, which led African Americans throughout the city to conduct "ride-ins" and fill the seats. Ultimately, the streetcar company capitulated and allowed mixed seating.[34] In 1896, a group of women led a boycott in Atlanta after a black man was imprisoned for refusing to sit in the section designated for blacks. In the two decades of the 1890s and 1900s, African Americans organized boycotts of segregated streetcar companies in at least twenty-five cities and in every former Confederate state.[35]

In Raleigh, five years after the first local Jim Crow law passed in 1898 requiring the separation of races in public transportation in, there was a scuffle on a Raleigh streetcar after several African Americans refused to give up their seats to white women. But such instances were rare and did not develop into a citywide mass movement like the sit-in movement of the 1960s. Even as black business grew in the Triangle, there were always voices adamantly opposing segregation and the discrimination that it fostered and reinforced. At Raleigh's annual Emancipation Day on January 1, 1919, Professor Charles H. Boyer of Saint Augustine's School not only demanded equal opportunities in public education but also protested segregation laws. Boyer's son James would ultimately become the president of Saint Augustine's, which became a hive of student activism during the civil rights protests of the 1960s.[36]

---

[34] Maria Fleming, *A Place at the Table: Struggles for Equality in America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 36, 41; Carter, *The New Negro of the South*, 10.
[35] Tera Hunter, *To 'Joy My Freedom: Southern Black Women's Lives and Labors After the Civil War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), 99; Litwack, *Trouble in Mind*, 242.
[36] K. Todd Johnson and Elizabeth Reid Murray, *Wake: Capital County of North Carolina, Volume II: Reconstruction to 1920* (Raleigh: Wake County Commissioners, 2008), 45.

In every generation after the Civil War, there were examples of direct-action to oppose segregation and discrimination against African Americans, but most failed to sustain momentum in the face of white supremacist governments in the South. In 1947, the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), which had been founded in 1942, launched the "Journey of Reconciliation" to challenge segregated interstate bus travel. Specifically, the CORE activists were testing whether states would ignore the recent Supreme Court decision in *Irene Morgan v. the Commonwealth of Virginia*, which had ruled that segregation on interstate buses was illegal based on the Constitution's Interstate Commerce Clause. The interracial group travelled through various cities in Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee and Kentucky. After embarking from Washington, D.C., the group made a stop in Richmond, and then Petersburg, Virginia. Before the Trailways bus left Petersburg for its trip to Raleigh, one of the African Americans in the group was arrested and released on $25 bond. On a trip from Durham to Chapel Hill, two black men were arrested, including Bayard Rustin, a leading figure in CORE, who eventually played a crucial role in organizing the 1963 March on Washington. James Peck, the white man who was severely beaten during the 1961 Freedom Rides, was also arrested. Ultimately, the three were released without charge when an attorney arrived on their behalf. In Chapel Hill, police arrested four of the riders, including Rustin, who later was sentenced to thirty days on the road gang. After the men were released in Chapel Hill, Charlie Jones, a white Presbyterian minister, drove the group to his house. Local residents

threatened to burn down his house, but the group ultimately escaped Chapel Hill and continued on to other cities.[37]

The Journey of Reconciliation was in many ways a precursor to the more sustained Freedom Rides in the early 1960s. Likewise, the sit-in movement of the 1960s had predecessors in the years prior to the February 1, 1960, sit-in Greensboro that sparked a new phase in the civil rights struggle. In the nation's capital, the NAACP college chapter at Howard University helped bring about desegregation at the Little Palace cafeteria in 1943 through the use of picketing and sit-ins. In Durham in 1957, Reverend Douglass Moore led sit-ins at the Royal Ice Cream Parlor, with most of the participants being students at North Carolina College at Durham (NCC), which foreshadowed the important role that students from that college would play in the 1960's sit-ins. The following year, the Wichita Kansas NAACP Youth Council organized sit-in demonstrations that led to desegregation of the Dockum Drug Store and other local businesses. Sit-ins in Oklahoma City also led to the desegregation of major chain stores in Oklahoma City.[38]

Hence, there were several examples of black activism in the period between 1865 and 1960. Just as the Montgomery bus boycott was not the first example of challenges to segregated buses, the Freedom Rides of 1961 had historical predecessors, as did the sit-ins of the 1960s. Yet the tradition of black activism prior to the outbreak of a sustained

---

[37] Bayard Rustin and George Houser, "We Challenged Jim Crow!" A Report Prepared for CORE and the Fellowship of Reconciliation, April 1947, General Collection, Greensboro History Museum, Greensboro, North Carolina; Robert Weisbrot, *Freedom Bound: A History of America's Civil Rights Movement* (New York: Penguin Books, 1990), 13; Art Chansky: *Game Changers: Dean Smith, Charlie Scott, and the Era that Transformed a Southern College Town* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016), 31.
[38] Thomas L. Bynum, *NAACP Youth and the Fight for Black Freedom, 1963-1965* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2013), xvii, xviii.

direct-action movement in the wake of the Greensboro sit-ins should not overshadow the fact that the students from black colleges in North Carolina and throughout the South were a special generation of activists. In Raleigh, students from Shaw University and Saint Augustine's College provided the backbone of a local movement (as did those at NCC in Durham) that was emblematic of other movements in North Carolina and the South that challenged segregation in a more sustained, direct manner than had previously occurred in most cities. By the 1960s, the scholar that was perhaps the most qualified to address the connection between the history of African American activism and the significance of local activists in Raleigh in the early 1960s was Shaw University professor Wilmoth Carter, a consistent supporter of student activism. In her study, *The New Negro of the South*, Carter points out that the precedent for various forms of activism had been established before 1960 but argues that "the essential difference is that prior to 1960 they were highly localized, and often individual, whereas in the 1960s they became generalized and collectivized."[39]

Nonetheless, there were examples of organizational development that helped establish the roots of a massive movement to resist segregation, many of which had their roots at Shaw University and NCC. Shaw graduate and NCC president James Shepard, NCC graduate and *Carolina Times* (a black newspaper in Durham) editor Louis Austin, and North Carolina Mutual president Charles Clinton Spaulding were among the founding members of the Durham Committee on Negro Affairs (DCNA) in 1935. The organization committed itself to the "educational, economic, social-civic, and political

[39] Carter, *The New Negro of the South*, 10.

welfare of the Negro," and had the motto of "A voteless people is a hopeless people."[40] Meanwhile, Shepard and faculty members at NCC advocated for the hiring of black policemen and fire department personnel and for equal job opportunities in municipal, state, and federal government and private industries in the 1930s. In Raleigh in 1932, fifteen local African Americans founded the Negro Citizens Coordinating Committee, which eventually changed its name to the Raleigh Citizens Association (RCA). Robert Prentiss Daniel, who was the second African American president of Shaw University, was among the original members. The group mostly focused on increasing black voter registration and participation.[41]

Both the DCNA and the RCA were important organizations in organizing black political activity in the two cities. But their influence in bringing forth direct challenges to segregation should not be overstated. The DCNA did not endorse the 1957 sit-ins at the Royal Ice Cream Parlor in Durham, although it did come out in support of the 1960 sit-ins. By the outbreak of the sit-ins in 1960 in Raleigh, the RCA was mostly dormant and was reinvigorated by the sit-in movement.[42] The key point is that it was the student activism in the form of sit-ins and picketing that provided the impetus for the DCNA and RCA to take stronger and more pointed stands against segregation.

One of the most significant conferences of African American leaders in the South took place on the campus of NCC in 1942. Fifty-nine black leaders, mostly from the South, met and ultimately issued "A Basis for Inter-Racial Cooperation and Development

---

[40] Greene, *Our Separate Ways*, 21; Brown, *Upbuilding Black Durham*, 336.
[41] Thorpe, *A Concise History of North Carolina Central University*, 19, 52; "Let Us March On," 4-5; Carter, *Shaw's Universe*, 82, 90. The first African American president at Shaw was William Stuart Nelson in 1931.
[42] "Citizens Committee Reactivated in City," *The Carolinian*, 20 February 1960, 1.

in the South," which came to be known as the Durham Manifesto. Among those in attendance were Shepard, Daniel, and James T. Taylor, the Dean of Men at NCC. W.E.B. DuBois, who was teaching at Atlanta University at that time, was not present, but offered this comment: "The planning of programs to guide the future of the Negro has not been in vain. On the whole the Durham program is a pretty good document." The conference inspired further meetings that eventually led to the creation of the interracial Southern Regional Council in 1944.[43]

The Durham Manifesto should be understood in the context of its times, which included U.S. involvement in World War II. The statement was accurate in its proclamation that the war "sharpened the issue of Negro-white relations in the United States, and particularly in the South." The group pointed out that African American soldiers who returned from World War I were not met with evidence of respect for the democracy for which they had fought. In the year prior to U.S. entry into the war, NAACP leader Walter White asked members at the annual convention, "What point is there in fighting and perhaps dying to save democracy if there is no democracy to save?" During World War II, many blacks recognized the contradiction of members of their race fighting a war against tyranny abroad when they faced intense discrimination in their own nation.[44]

---

[43] "Southern Conference on Race Relations," Durham, North Carolina, October 20, 1942, 5, 12-13, 15, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/southernconferen00sout (accessed July 10, 2017); Greene, *Our Separate Ways*, 15.

[44] David Levering Lewis, *W.E.B. DuBois: The Fight for Equality and the American Century, 1919-1963* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2000), 466.

The group who met in Durham in 1942 exhibited both the areas in which black leaders were willing to challenge existing restrictions to the rights of African Americans but also the limits of how aggressively they would challenge segregation. They advocated for increased funding for black schools and pay equality for black and white teachers, as well as equal pay for equal work in other occupations. The group also recognized the obligation of all citizens to serve in the military and advocated for equality of opportunity in regards to chances to rise in military rank. In the section under "Political and Civil Rights," the group decried police brutality and suggested the employment of black police officers. The group also called for the abolition of the all-white primary. Throughout much of the South in the first six decades of the twentieth century, securing the Democratic nomination was tantamount to winning the election. Thus, the all-white primary was another tool utilized to disfranchise African Americans until the U.S. Supreme Court effectively struck down the all-white primary in *Smith v. Allwright* in 1944.[45]

Despite the expression of ways in which opportunities for African Americans could be improved, the Durham Manifesto did not project a pointed attack on segregated practices. The aforementioned suggestions made by the group in the area of education did not directly challenge segregated schools or suggest that separate schools were inherently unequal. Indeed, there were instances in which the document seems to implicitly accept segregation. "In the public carriers and terminals, where segregation of the races is currently made mandatory by law as well as by established custom, it is the

[45] "Southern Conference on Race Relations," 6-7; "Let Us March On," 6. Raleigh hired its first black police officer since the Reconstruction era in 1942, and Durham did so in 1944.

duty of Negro and white citizens to insist that these provisions be equal in kind and quality and in character of maintenance."[46] The emphasis on equality of service rather than integration demonstrated a key difference between the goals of the adult black leaders at the 1942 conference in Durham and that of the mostly student leaders that met on the Shaw University campus in April 1960.

One of the most egregious acts of racial violence in Durham's history occurred two years after the meeting of the group at NCC who produced the Durham Manifesto. In early July 1944, a white bus driver ordered a uniformed African American soldier, Booker T. Spicely, to move to the back of the bus. Spicely commented, "I thought I was fighting this war for democracy." As the soldier grudgingly walked to the rear of the bus, he muttered, "If you weren't 4-F [someone deemed unfit for military service], you wouldn't be driving this bus." The soldier then apologized, but his apology was not enough. After the soldier exited the bus, the driver fired two shots that killed Pfc. Spicely.[47]

The Spicely murder was evidence that challenges to segregation could literally be a matter of life and death, even in a city in the Upper South. It also demonstrated that obtaining justice for even the most egregious acts of racial violence was not likely. Two months after the killing, an all-white jury acquitted the man who murdered an American soldier.[48] In the midst of an era in which Americans were fighting fascist regimes in order to ostensibly preserve democracy at home, the implications of the Spicely case

[46] "Southern Conference on Race Relations," 7.
[47] Greene, *Our Separate Ways*, 19.
[48] Ibid.

were evident: blacks were systematically denied the rights of first-class citizens in a segregated society. While the federal government deemed Spicely fit for service, a southern court deemed him unworthy of the most basic of human rights.

In the wake of the Spicely killing, a group of local African Americans met and elected a new slate of NAACP officers, including Louis Austin as president. In the efforts to revitalize the Durham NAACP branch, the influence of people associated with Shaw University was apparent. According to historian Christina Greene, Shaw University Biology Department Chair R. Arline Young was instrumental in revitalizing the Durham branch of the NAACP. Young enlisted the help of a Shaw graduate who was then based in New York City, Ella Baker. Like Young, Baker was concerned that the traditional black leadership in Durham was an impediment to the development of more aggressive challenges to segregation. But some of the more "conservative" black leaders like Shepard appeared to recognize the move toward a more assertive attack on segregation. Shepard did not object to Young's efforts to establish a college chapter of the NAACP at NCC. Young played a significant role in establishing statewide NAACP youth councils, and her efforts were carried on in the 1950s by NCC graduate Floyd B. McKissick.[49] The participation in youth councils and college chapters (especially at Shaw and NCC) of the NAACP was one of the ways in which the student activists who participated in sit-ins in the early 1960s carried on some of the organizing traditions established in previous decades, many of which had been associated with Shaw or NCC.

[49] Greene, *Our Separate Ways*, 21, 25.

One of the most striking examples of the involvement of a group from NCC in challenging a segregated society occurred in 1944. Without permission from Dr. Shepard, NCC basketball coach John McLendon organized a basketball game against a Duke medical school team that had defeated the Duke varsity team previously. Much like the NCC Eagles had done in the Colored Intercollegiate Athletic Association (CIAA), the team from Duke had dominated their competition that year. Coach McLendon, who ultimately became the first black head coach of a predominantly white institution (at Cleveland State in 1965), later recalled, "There was always a little part of you that wondered whether you could really compete with them—white teams—or not. And until you did, there was no way to know."[50]

Early in the game, it seemed the Eagles would lose, as they trailed by twelve midway through the first half. A hard foul nearly resulted in a fight, and the momentum began to shift. After trailing by eight at halftime, the Eagles turned up the pressure and played the fast-paced game that was their trademark. As the Eagles gained confidence, they went on huge scoring runs en route to an impressive 88-44 victory. In *The Secret Game: A Wartime Story of Courage, Change, and Basketball's Lost Triumph,* Scott Ellsworth depicts how many of the NCC students had curiously come to the gym, only to find the doors locked. But a few had worked their way up to the window ledges late in the first half and looked inside. In Ellsworth's eloquent description, "They could not believe what they saw. Nor were they alone. For as the morning wore on, more and

[50] Scott Ellsworth, *The Secret Game: A Wartime Story of Courage, Change, and Basketball's Lost Triumph* (New York: Little, Brown and Company, 2015), 299-300, 262.

more heads began to appear in the windows, wide-eyed witnesses to an unimaginable, brave new world."[51]

The secret game between NCC and Duke students in 1944 was one example of the limited interaction between black and white college students in North Carolina. In the previous decade, an NCC student sought to integrate the state's pre-eminent public university. In 1933, under the encouragement of Durham lawyers Conrad O. Pearson and Cecil McCoy, NCC student Thomas Hocutt applied to the University of North Carolina's pharmacy school. After he was rejected due to his race, Pearson and McCoy, with NAACP support, filed suit in what became the first legal action to attempt to desegregate public higher education in the South. Some of the members of the black elite supported the challenge, including C.C. Spaulding, but he later advised against the lawsuit, largely for fear of provoking violence. NCC President James Shepard privately attempted to talk Hocutt out of proceeding, and even sent faculty member Alfonso Elder (who would later become president of the college) to attempt to discourage Hocutt from continuing the case, to no avail. As the president of a state-supported college, Shepard was concerned with potential funding cuts if he publicly supported attempts at integration. Historian Jerry Gershenhorn argues, "While Shepard and Spaulding's visions of the future were based upon a short-term adaptation to segregation, Hocutt's youthful supporters sought an immediate end to segregation and the injustices it perpetuated."[52]

---

[51] Ellsworth, *The Secret Game*, 273, 269.
[52] Jerry Gershenhorn, "*Hocutt v. Wilson* and Race Relations in Durham, North Carolina During the 1930s," *North Carolina Historical Review*, 78, 3 (July 2001): 291, 296, 304.

Hocutt's lawyers based their petition to the state superior court on the equal protection and due process clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and argued that North Carolina laws did not explicitly mandate segregated universities. Ultimately, the judge ruled against Hocutt on two counts. For one, the court could only order UNC to rule on Hocutt's application in an impartial manner but could not compel UNC to admit a student. Second, the court ruled that the application was incomplete, as Shepard had withheld Hocutt's transcript. As Gershenhorn points out, the incomplete transcript justification was specious due to the fact that UNC's pharmacy school was an undergraduate program, and thus, seemingly would have only required a high school transcript.[53] Various historians have interpreted the case differently, with Christina Greene emphasizing that some NAACP leaders believed that Spaulding and Shepard "sabotaged" the case, while Leslie Brown maintains that "Hocutt lost on a technicality that was engineered by James E. Shepard, president of North Carolina College for Negroes, which intentionally withheld Hocutt's transcript."[54] There is little doubt that Shepard hurt Hocutt's chances of winning the case, but the fact that the judge offered two explanations reveals that the withholding of the transcript was not the only reason for the failure in the case. In addition, as would be seen in many later cases, including Joseph Holt's effort at integrating the Raleigh city schools in the late 1950s, denying integration based on a "technicality" could be quite broadly applied in southern courts that seemed bent on preserving segregation.[55]

---

[53] Gershenhorn, "*Hocutt v. Wilson* and Race Relations in Durham, North Carolina During the 1930s," 300.
[54] Greene, *Our Separate Ways*, 21; Brown, *Upbuilding Black Durham*, 312.
[55] See chapter four for more analysis on Joseph Holt, Jr. and school integration efforts.

Nonetheless, further challenges to segregation in higher education in North Carolina preceded the momentous 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* decision. Once again, NCC students were at the heart of the battle. In *McKissick v. Carmichael*, NAACP Legal Defense lawyer Thurgood Marshall, as well as Pearson, argued for the admission of black applicants to the law school at UNC on the basis that the somewhat recently created North Carolina College School of Law was inferior in resources and facilities.[56] UNC attorneys countered by calling representatives from the state's legal establishment to testify. Wake Forest law professor I. Beverly Lake testified that a student could get just as good of a law education at NCC as at UNC. The judge, a North Carolina native, agreed and held that the two law schools offered an equal legal education. Marshall and Pearson appealed the decision, and on March 27, 1951, the Fourth Circuit court in Richmond Virginia reversed the decision.[57]

In May 1951, World War II veteran and former NCC student Floyd B. McKissick became one of the first five black students to matriculate at UNC, after three years of study at the NCC law school while the case progressed. Like the other students, he faced harassment and later recalled that white students put dead snakes in his clothes drawer and rigged water buckets to douse him upon opening his door. McKissick's role in integrating the law school at UNC foreshadowed his civil rights activism in the Triangle and beyond in the coming years. In the early 1960s, he was one of the most ardent

[56] In the wake of a 1938 U.S. Supreme Court decision forcing officials in Missouri to either accept blacks at a white-only law school or create a similar school for blacks, North Carolina politicians quickly acted to help establish a law school at NCC in order to avert forced desegregation of the UNC law school. See Richard A. Rosen and Joseph Mosnier, *Julius Chambers: A Life in the Legal Struggle for Civil Rights* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016), 26.
[57] Rosen and Mosnier, *Julius Chambers*, 26-28.

supporters of student protestors in the region, including his daughter Joycelyn. Like her father, Joycelyn had blazed a trail for integration by becoming the first African American to attend a previously all-white school in Durham in 1959.[58]

As African Americans dealt with segregation and discriminatory practices in the century after emancipation, a seemingly disparate viewpoint about higher education was developing in the Triangle and throughout the country: academic freedom. Connections between conceptions of academic freedom and concerns over the rights of African Americans were intermittent but not insignificant in the period before the height of the civil rights movement in the 1960s. At UNC and Duke University, the promotion of academic freedom provided a context for a more reasoned discussion of race relations and the impact of segregation in the Triangle and throughout the South.

Academic freedom is an amorphous concept that has been variously defined in different time periods and locations. One scholar points out, "There is, one soon discovers, no clear and widely accepted definition or justification of academic freedom and no settled account of the way in which claims of violation may be assessed."[59] In 1955, the director of the American Academic Freedom Project at Columbia University, Robert MacIver, declared that "the broad meaning of academic freedom is plain enough. It is the freedom of the scholar within the institution devoted to scholarship, 'the academy.'"[60] While the freedom of a professor to express ideas that contribute to knowledge in his or her field is perhaps the clearest example of academic freedom, the

[58] Rosen and Mosnier, *Julius Chambers*, 29-30; Greene, *Our Separate Ways*, 73-74.
[59] Edmund Pincoffs, ed., *The Concept of Academic Freedom* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1975), vii.
[60] Robert M. MacIver, *Academic Freedom in Our Time* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), 3.

right to express ideas outside of that expertise have been more heavily contested. Additionally, while academic freedom is generally considered the purview of the professor or faculty member, one must consider the impact on students as well. As MacIver points out, "The two freedoms, the intellectual freedom of the teacher, and intellectual freedom of the taught, though certain distinctions must be drawn between them, are closely associated and are interactive."[61]

One of the factors that made the Triangle unique in the South was its commitment to higher education and the prominent role that Duke University and UNC played in shaping ideas of academic freedom. UNC professor Benjamin Sherwood Hedrick was involved in what was likely the most celebrated academic freedom case dealing with the issue of slavery. As word got out that he planned to support Republican candidate John C. Fremont in 1856, public pressure mounted for him to resign. He responded in a statement in which he gave Jeffersonian reasons for his opposition to the extension of slavery and for his support of Fremont. Hedrick denied that his students would receive any sort of free soil indoctrination, and he refused to resign. Despite support from some faculty, Hedrick was dismissed by the school's trustees. This early case in which academic freedom was restricted based largely on an issue related to race relations also demonstrated the often intertwined connection between restrictions on civil liberties and academic freedom. As Richard Hofstadter points out, neither civil liberty nor religious liberty are identical with academic freedom; "however, both of these more inclusive

[61] MacIver, *Academic Freedom in Our Time*, 10.

rights are at points broadly analogous to academic freedom, and altogether they provided the historical matrix of the concept of academic liberties."[62]

Despite the outcome of the Hedrick case in the antebellum era, North Carolina's two most prestigious institutions of higher learning would generally defend academic freedom, even when the cases dealt with race relations. In 1903, in the wake of white supremacist campaigns to re-establish Democratic Party dominance throughout the state, a professor at Trinity College (which was incorporated into Duke University in the 1920s) became the victim of verbal attacks and calls for his ouster after writing an article for the *South Atlantic Quarterly* that was critical of prevailing views about racial inequality. History professor John S. Bassett wrote that blacks were becoming "too intelligent and too refined" to continue to accept their inferior status. Bassett claimed that white men must adopt "these children of Africa into our American life."[63] While not devoid of some of the paternalistic language that often characterized white views about blacks, Bassett's arguments were radical in a time when the political and social atmosphere in the state was reactionary. Bassett's article led to calls throughout the Triangle for his expulsion. *News and Observer* editor Josephus Daniels led the attack on Bassett and called for him to issue a full retraction of his statements. As local pressure mounted, Bassett submitted his resignation.[64]

What followed was one of the most glaring examples of the defense of academic freedom in American history. Fifteen alumni petitioned for Bassett to be retained,

---

[62] Richard Hofstadter and Walter P. Metzger, *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), 258-262.
[63] Hofstadter and Metzger, *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States*, 446.
[64] Hofstadter and Metzger, *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States*, 447.

including one who maintained that a professor from the school "should be allowed to hold and express any rational opinion he may have about any subject whatsoever."[65] Ultimately, the Board of Trustees voted 18-7 to allow Bassett to keep his job. The statement that accompanied the decision declared, "We are particularly unwilling to lend ourselves to any tendency to destroy or limit academic liberty."[66] The statement also defended the decision in light of civil liberties, maintaining that "we cannot lend countenance to the degrading notion that professors in American colleges have not an equal liberty of thought and speech with all other Americans." As historian Walter Metzger points out, "These were memorable phrases and they became notable additions to the *belles-lettres* of academic freedom."[67]

The Bassett case, especially the statement that defended the decision to retain him, demonstrated the connection between free speech and academic freedom. But Bassett's ability to speak on such a controversial topic as racial inequality was not merely a matter of free speech. Bassett was a historian and helped to pioneer the study of African American history in the state. Bassett once stated, "I desire to find out what there is in the negro, what he has done and what he can and will do."[68] Thus, Bassett's article discussing race relations and the potential for African Americans in society was not simply a matter of expressing personal views, but an act of utilizing his knowledge to discuss a crucial issue in society. The constitution of the United States protected his right to express his views without legal punishment. But it was the evolving concept of

---

[65] Hofstadter and Metzger, *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States, 448.*
[66] MacIver, *Academic Freedom in Our Time*, 272.
[67] Hofstadter and Metzger, *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States*, 449.
[68] LeLoudis, *Schooling the New South*, 184.

academic freedom at institutions such as Trinity College, one that had to stand tall in the face of public pressure, which protected his job.

The Trinity College Board of Trustees' defense of Bassett was indicative of the ways in which academic freedom was used to defend those who sought to explore race relations in a more rational manner. It may have also demonstrated the influence of the Duke family, who had been primarily responsible for the growth of the college. The Dukes were Republicans and were despised by racial conservatives, who viewed them as enemies of white supremacy. Perhaps the most prescient statement in regards to the Bassett case is one which not only hinted at the racial violence of the period, but also the dangers of sacrificing academic freedom in the face of public pressure. In an appeal to the college to retain Bassett, Benjamin N. Duke warned, "There are more ways of lynching a man than by tying a hempen rope around his neck and throwing it over the limb of a tree. Public opinion can lynch a man, and that is what North Carolina is trying to do to Bassett now. Don't allow it. You'll never get over it if you do."[69]

The concept of academic freedom was given more formal description in a founding document of the newly created American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in 1915. The AAUP produced The *Declaration of Principles on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure*, which seemed to echo Benjamin Duke's concerns about public opinion. The group of scholars that created the document warned of the "tyranny of public opinion" and opined that "an inviolable refuge from such tyranny should be

[69] Hofstadter and Metzger, *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States*, 450.

found in the university."[70] The *Declaration* emphasizes the premise that the purpose of a university education is not to provide students with ready-made conclusions but "to train them to think for themselves, and to provide access to those materials which they need if they are to think intelligently."[71] Thus, the freedom of the professor in the classroom was linked to student learning.

In addition, the *Declaration* also addressed the "freedom of extramural utterance and action." The *Declaration* offers the view that scholars should not be barred from giving their opinions on controversial questions. Perhaps the clearest establishment of a principle that would have implications for the relationship between academic freedom and the civil rights movement (which is addressed in later chapters) was the following statement: "It is clearly not proper that they should be prohibited from lending their active support to organized movements which they believe to be in the public interest."[72]

Just as the founding of the AAUP and the creation of the *Declaration* impacted conceptions of academic freedom, the tendency among UNC professors to embrace ideas of academic freedom had implications for race relations in the state. In the 1920s, UNC president Harry Woodburn Chase was an ardent defender of academic freedom and presided over the institution in a period when UNC leaders viewed academic freedom as a social good and as a key to southern progress. Historian Charles J. Holden maintains that "by invoking academic freedom as a necessary function of the modern intellectual's expertise, some at UNC took and defended extremely unpopular positions against

---

[70] Matthew W. Finkin and Robert C. Post, *For the Common Good: Principles of American Academic Freedom* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 172.
[71] Finkin and Post, *For the Common Good*, 80.
[72] Ibid., 178.

segregation and industrial exploitation of workers."[73] Holden also points out how UNC scholars in the 1920s and 1930s used their ability to treat southern race relations as an academic issue. Faculty research on the Ku Klux Klan enabled scholars to criticize the organization and expose some of the KKK's false claims. The academic freedom that allowed professors to analyze race issues as a scholarly endeavor helped to produce a much more critical stance on racial violence and segregation.[74] Of course, examining and critiquing the KKK was different than making an all-out attack on segregation, but nonetheless, the academic freedom at UNC provided an avenue for addressing racial concerns in a more open and less emotional manner.

In 1927, UNC welcomed NAACP leader James Weldon Johnson to campus, a daring move in light of the hatred that many whites had toward the organization. University leaders treated his appearance as a purely academic event, and the *Daily Tar Heel* newspaper even cleverly described Johnson as a "negro poet," taking care not to mention his NAACP affiliation. According to Holden, "UNC's leaders felt confident that their academic freedom to examine the issue of race relations was helping lead the South toward a better racial situation."[75]

In his inaugural address in 1931, new UNC president Frank Porter Graham spelled out what academic freedom could mean at an institution such as UNC. For faculty, that involved their right to teach and speak freely as scholars without interference from the University or the state. He also discussed the impact of academic freedom on

---

[73] Charles J. Holden, *The New Southern University: Academic Freedom and Liberalism at UNC* (University Press of Kentucky, 2012), 22.
[74] Holden, *The New Southern University*, 27.
[75] Ibid., 45, 47.

students, suggesting that it meant "a growing sense of responsibility and student citizenship," as well as the "right of lawful assembly and free discussions by any students of any issues and views whatsoever."[76] By the late 1930s, some UNC students and faculty increasingly criticized segregation itself and viewed racial progress through the lens of ending segregation rather than merely reforming it. The support of academic freedom did not necessarily imply a progressive view toward race relations overall at UNC. The denial of Hocutt's application in 1933 was just one indicator of that reality. But it did provide a context for research on race issues (especially by UNC's famous sociologists) and the problems that African Americans confronted in a segregated society.[77]

In the 1940s, Graham also worked behind the scenes to defend embattled professors in other southern states like Georgia who risked termination for their "liberal" views on race issues. Graham publicly defended University of Texas president Homer P. Rainey in the mid-1940s when the Texas Board of Regents removed him from the presidency for his liberal views on race and labor. Rainey acknowledged Graham as the leader of academic freedom in the South and commended him for his "fearless and courageous leadership."[78] Thus, the top leadership and some of the faculty at UNC had already established themselves as defenders of academic freedom prior to the sit-in movement of the early 1960s. In some cases, that opened opportunities for better understanding of African American concerns and the impact of segregation. But it was

[76] Holden, *The New Southern University*, 84.
[77] Ibid., 88, 102-106.
[78] Ibid., 157.

not until the civil rights activism largely emanating from the three historically black campuses in the Triangle in the early 1960s that the connections between academic freedom and black civil rights became a powerful force for challenging segregation.

The development of what eventually became Shaw University had established some of the roots of black higher education that impacted several facets of black life in the Triangle and throughout the state. Shaw graduates rose to prominent political positions, helped to foster the growth of black business, and played prominent roles in developing black colleges, including NCC in Durham. Ironically, the very segregated practices that in some respects isolated black colleges helped produce activists who not only recognized their own talents, but also the history of the South that had placed limits on the development of those talents.

On the eve of the sit-in movement that commenced in earnest in February 1960, there were several cracks in the walls of segregation in the Tar Heel state. Challenges by African American students, including those at NCC, to segregated practices at institutions of higher learning had produced initially frustrating, but ultimately tangible results by the 1950s. While there had been instances of direct-action both in the Triangle and other cities in the South since the Civil War, many black communities were not united in their resistance to segregation. The tepid response among many African American leaders in Durham to the sit-ins at the Royal Ice Cream Parlor in 1957 was an indicator that direct challenges to segregation in the Triangle were still viewed by some as impractical or too dangerous. Thus, it would take a special generation of activists who not only recognized the importance of higher learning in paving the long road to black freedom, but also that

participating in a movement that challenged a segregated society that limited the potential of that education could be a fundamental *part* of their education. And so on a cold and snowy week in the Triangle, student activists in Raleigh proceeded from Shaw to the heart of downtown, from campus to counter.

CHAPTER III

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND THE 1960 SIT-INS

Tension mounted as students from Shaw University and St. Augustine's College picketed outside segregated stores in downtown Raleigh on the afternoon of February 16, 1960. A group of white teenagers and a few white men verbally taunted and pushed some of the protestors and reportedly slapped a black woman. This abuse was mild in comparison to the incident the following day in which a white man struck Shaw University student Otis Clark with a chain after Clark confronted another white man who had taken a protest sign from St. Augustine's College student Henry Moss. Clark reacted to the chain attack with a solid right to the man's cheek and sent him staggering into a parked car. The sit-ins and pickets in Raleigh had begun a week earlier and these were the first reported incidences of violence.[1] In fact, violence toward the protestors was relatively rare (and by the protestors even more rare), but the taunts and verbal assaults were more common. Thus, the violence of these two days in Raleigh was more anomalous than emblematic.

While the reported physical violence was the most newsworthy aspect, perhaps the most telling aspect of the February 16 demonstration could be read on one of the protest signs that asserted, "You Just Can't 'Lump' Justice." The sign was an obvious

[1] "Students Carrying Signs Picket at Raleigh Stores," *The News and Observer*, 17 February 1960, 1; David Cooper, "Two White Men Arrested Here After Encounter with Negroes," *The News and Observer*, 18 February 1960, 1, 2; Otis Tucker, Jr., mail interview by the author, received 5 May 2016; Leroy Cofield, phone conversation with the author, 20 April, 2016.

jab at North Carolina Attorney General Malcolm Seawell, who had responded to criticism by the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) for his critical position on student sit-ins by saying that "I stand by what I have said—if you like it, well and good—if you do not like it, you may lump it."[2] College students were especially disapproving of Seawell's stance that college administrators could or, in his estimation, should attempt to curb their students from participating in sit-ins.[3]

This chapter addresses the 1960 sit-ins and protest demonstrations in Raleigh, Durham, and other cities in North Carolina and reveals that ideas of academic freedom gave the protest movement support from students and faculty from historically black, as well as predominantly white, colleges and universities. In Raleigh and Durham, the sit-in movement was primarily led by students at the historically black schools of Shaw University, Saint Augustine's College, and North Carolina College at Durham (NCC), which I term the "Protest Triangle" schools. Activists at these schools viewed their participation in civil rights protests as part of their education and as a way of opening societal opportunities. By extension, they viewed any restrictions on their participation by political leaders or school officials as a restriction on their academic freedom.[4] Protestors received support from some students and faculty at predominantly white colleges, especially the Research Triangle schools of Duke University, the University of North Carolina (UNC), and North Carolina State College (NC State). Ultimately, I demonstrate that an expanded vision of academic freedom, one that viewed the students'

[2] "Students Carrying Signs Picket at Raleigh Stores," *The News and Observer*, 17 February 1960, 1; "'Like it or Lump It': Seawell Fires Back at ACLU," *The News and Observer*, 13 February 1960, 3.
[3] Charles Clay, "Three Alternatives: Seawell Cites Legal Aspects of Sitdowns," *The News and Observer*, 11 February 1960, 1, 2.
[4] See survey results in appendix.

right to participate in civil rights demonstrations as part of their education, was critical in mobilizing support from black and white students and faculty in the Triangle.

Students from historically black colleges provided the backbone for the sit-ins and other civil rights demonstrations in 1960. As chapter one makes clear, the Greensboro sit-in of February 1, 1960, was not the first attempt to integrate lunch counters in the South, but the action by the "Greensboro Four" of Ezell Blair, Jr. (now Jibreel Khazan), Franklin McCain, Joseph McNeil, and David Richmond helped spark a more aggressive phase in the struggle for black freedom. The sit-in produced an immediate response from students at the historically black North Carolina Agricultural and Technical College, and by the following day, twenty-nine students participated in the sit-ins at Woolworth. Within five days over three hundred students were participating and the protest spread to S.H. Kress. Ultimately, the sit-ins spread to several cities in every state throughout the South with perhaps seventy thousand students participating in some capacity. According to Adam Fairclough, approximately three thousand six hundred students were arrested in 1960 alone for offenses such as trespassing and disorderly conduct.[5] William Chafe has argued that the Greensboro sit-ins were a "watershed in the history of America."[6] While black activism in Greensboro and other cities in North Carolina was certainly not born on February 1, 1960, the actions of the Greensboro Four helped give force to a strategy that could directly challenge segregation in the streets and at the lunch counters. One did not

[5] Adam Fairclough, *Better Day Coming: Blacks and Equality, 1890-2000* (New York: Penguin Books, 2001), 242-243.
[6] William H. Chafe: *Civilities and Civil Rights: Greensboro, North Carolina and the Struggle for Black Freedom* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), 71.

need to be a member of any civil rights organization nor did sit-in participants need to have any political connections to demonstrate their displeasure with segregation.

In addition to the students at North Carolina A&T, students from the historically black, all-female Bennett College played a major role in the Greensboro sit-ins as well. As Chafe points out, Bennett had been a model of racial strength for many years prior to 1960. Since it was a private institution, it did not have to "kowtow to public prejudices" in order to appease state officials for funding. Chafe argues that Bennett College president Dr. Willa Player best exemplified adult support for the student movement. In addition to supporting the students, she was the first black person to turn in her charge card at Meyer's Department Store, which refused to desegregate its lunch counter. When sit-ins returned to Greensboro in earnest in 1963, Player began to mobilize her staff at Bennett College to support the movement.[7]

Administrators at state-supported colleges were under pressure from state and local political leaders to curtail student involvement in the demonstrations. After the initial wave of sit-ins in 1960, North Carolina A&T President Warmoth T. Gibbs met with city leaders, who asked him to discourage students from protesting in Greensboro. Gibbs did not take any disciplinary action against the students that staged the sit-ins. When city leaders asked Gibbs to keep the students on campus, he replied, "We teach our students how think, not what to think."[8] While Gibbs hardly took a leading role in

[7] Chafe, *Civilities and Civil Rights*, 20, 97, 129.
[8] Fairclough, *Better Day Coming*, 243; See also "Key Players-Warmoth T. Gibbs," *Greensboro News and Record*, 2016, accessed August 25, 2016, http://www.sitins.com/warmothgibbs.shtml.

promoting the actions of the students, his refusal to take disciplinary action against the students showed an implicit support.

The reaction to the sit-ins in Greensboro and other North Carolina cities by the state's top political leaders was generally one of discouragement of the new tactic. No other phrase captured the response of state and local leaders more than the appeal to "law and order." In early March Governor Luther Hodges stated that "I have no sympathy whatsoever for any group of people who deliberately engage in activities which any reasonable person can see will result in a breakdown of law and order as well as interference with the normal and proper operation of a private business."[9] But those in favor of the sit-ins as a means of challenging segregation could easily point out the flaw of Hodges's reasoning. UNC student Associate Editor Frank Cowher wrote an editorial that asked, "Whose law and order, governor?" He pointed out that the state of North Carolina was essentially not complying with the laws established by the *Brown vs. Board of Education* decision of 1954.[10] Another UNC student, Thelma Howell, wrote a letter to Hodges pointing out that "Hitler and Stalin probably had law and order enforced, but they did not consider justice or nondiscrimination."[11] Both segregationists and integrationists appealed to certain laws to advance their cause in the early 1960s. But civil rights activists and those who sympathized with them recognized that law and justice was not the same thing. When pre-existing laws mandated segregation, civil rights activists

[9] Clay, "Three Alternatives," 1.
[10] Frank Cowher, "Editorial," *Carolina Times*, 26 March 1960, 2.
[11] Thelma Howell to Luther Hodges, 13 March 1960, Box 523, Folder: "Segregation: Sit-Down Situations," Governor's Papers, Luther Hodges, North Carolina State Archives, Raleigh, North Carolina.

challenged them. When no laws existed to mandate segregation, they sought to challenge the social traditions that preserved them.

In addition to appeals to law and order, local and state political leaders often portrayed the sit-ins as stirring racial problems. On February 10, the same day that the sit-ins spread to the capital city of Raleigh, state Attorney General Malcolm Seawell claimed that the black college students were doing "irreparable harm" to race relations with their "sit-down strikes."[12] Indeed, he was correct. The sit-ins were a clear demonstration that African Americans were in fact displeased with the current state of race relations. They adamantly opposed the idea that blacks were content with racial traditions in North Carolina and their respective cities. In response to the sit-ins, Raleigh Mayor William G. Enloe released a statement that said "it is regrettable that some of our young Negro students would risk endangering Raleigh's friendly and cooperative race relations by seeking to change a long-standing custom in a manner that is all but destined to fail."[13] Enloe obviously underestimated the will of the students to push on and force businesspeople and city leaders to make tough decisions. The leadership that came from college campuses was at the forefront of the struggle to create change in racial practices throughout North Carolina. In February, 1960 there was a long road ahead to achieving integration in public accommodations, but the crucial step of making it crystal clear that most African Americans were not content with racial segregation had been taken.

---

[12] Clay, "Three Alternatives," 1.
[13] Charles Craven and David Cooper, "Student Sitdown Strike Spreads to Stores Here," *News and Observer*, 11 February 1960, 1, 23.

The sit-in demonstrations not only initiated a new phase in the struggle for black freedom, but also brought to light competing ideas about academic freedom and the freedom of college students to engage in activities outside of the college. On February 10, Attorney General Malcolm Seawell said that college officials "have the perfect right, and probably the duty, through appropriate action to prohibit any action on the part of students which threatens or is prejudicial to the peace and welfare of the community."[14] Seawell's statement seemed to be blind to the fact that African Americans were a part of the community in which they lived, and that their grievances constituted a problem in their communities. Seawell also argued that the college stood in the "position of parents" to the students.[15] If indeed the college did have such a responsibility, the fact remained that many of the protestors' actual parents approved of their actions, especially when they were demonstrating with the limits of the law. The previously mentioned response to Seawell's statements by the ACLU appealed to the constitutional guarantees of equal treatment of all citizens, as the organization told Seawell, "We hope that rather than invade constitutional freedoms you will defend them."[16] Seawell responded that it was of the "utmost unimportance" to him what the ACLU thought.[17]

The question of whether college administrators should attempt to thwart the actions of students at their colleges became a prominent issue after three white students from Woman's College of the University of North Carolina (UNC Greensboro today) joined in the sit-ins in Greensboro on February 4, as did white students from Greensboro

[14] Clay, "Three Alternatives," 1.
[15] Ibid.
[16] New York (UPI), "Civil Liberties Union Replies to Seawell," *News and Observer*, 21 February 1960, 3.
[17] "'Like it Or Lump It,'" 3.

College and Guilford College. The three Woman's College students, Ann Dearsley, Genie Seaman, and Marilyn Lott, sat at the counter at Woolworth's and said they did not want to be served until African Americans were. Dearsley maintained that the protests were "being carried out by intelligent college students whose requests should be a natural right under law, not factors which have to be fought for."[18] In response to the students' actions, Woman's College Chancellor Gordon W. Blackwell addressed the Student Assembly on February 9, in which he pondered his own question of "was the sit-down demonstration, even though passively conducted, a wise move given the objectives of the participants? My answer must be an unequivocal 'No.'"[19] Thus it is clear that Blackwell was personally opposed to the sit-ins as a tactic. Whether this stance was due to personal prejudices or not remains unclear, but the important part of his position on the sit-ins dealt with the students' right to protest outside of the campus.

Blackwell's speech was plagued by contradictions as he stated that the college should never tell students what stand to take on controversial issues or how they should assert their rights as individuals and as citizens. Shortly thereafter, Blackwell continued, "But your responsibility as students at Woman's College goes beyond personal considerations. Your class jacket is a symbol of the College. On and off the campus you represent this institution. Your actions bring credit or discredit to the College. You are not living in a vacuum unencumbered by duties and responsibilities. The results of your actions may affect many others in a kind of chain reaction as has been painfully

[18] Greensboro (UPI), "Sitdown at Greensboro: White Students Back Negroes in Demands at Lunch Counter," *News and Observer*, 5 February 1960, 1.
[19] Chancellor Gordon W. Blackwell, "Talk to Student Assembly," 9 February 1960, Box 522, Folder: "Segregation: Lunch Counter (Negro) 1960," Governor's Papers, Luther Hodges, North Carolina State Archives.

demonstrated this week."[20] The irony was that a large portion of this excerpt could indeed have been used to support participation in the demonstrations. The women that joined the sit-ins undoubtedly understood that their responsibilities in society went beyond personal considerations. In an article in the Woman's College student newspaper, *The Carolinian*, Ann Dearsley stated that the students participated in order to express their sentiments about equality, freedom, and the rights of the individual as expressed in the U.S. Constitution.[21]

A further irony of the Blackwell speech was that he explicitly addressed the concern over academic freedom, stating, "A college must consider the matter of academic freedom of students as well as of faculty."[22] Yet the heart of Blackwell's speech was advising students to refrain from participation in the demonstrations. But if students were to take Blackwell's words to heart that "on and off the campus you represent this institution," it seemed a pretty clear restriction on their academic freedom to discourage their involvement. Blackwell's speech may have gone relatively unheralded if Governor Luther Hodges had not promoted it as a model for how college administrators should proceed. Hodges sent the speech to the heads of each of the state-supported colleges, both black and white.[23]

Hodges's support of Blackwell's stance was unpopular among many college students at black and predominantly white institutions. East Carolina College student

---

[20] Ibid.
[21] "Ann Dearsley Reviews Lunch Counter Strike," *The Carolinian [Woman's College of the University of North Carolina]*, 12 February 1960, 1,3. *The Carolinian* was also the name of a black newspaper in Raleigh.
[22] Blackwell, "Talk to Student Assemby."
[23] Charles Craven, "Governor Asks College Officials to Help Sitdown Protests," *News and Observer*, 1, 20.

Sandra Porter wrote a letter to Hodges that portrayed his appeal to the college administrators as a betrayal of academic freedom. She asserted that Hodges had "left the ethical yardstick behind" for "political expediency," but stated that the real problem that she had with Hodges's position was that "instructing students as to why, when, where and over what they may peacefully demonstrate is in direct opposition to any semblance of academic freedom."[24] Porter's letter is one piece of evidence among many others that demonstrate that many college students in North Carolina viewed restrictions on civil rights demonstrations as an assault on academic freedom.

Blackwell's and Hodges's stance on how college administrators should approach student demonstrators also drew fire from college faculty. In late March, a group of eight NC State professors belonging to the executive committee of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) sent a letter to Governor Hodges criticizing him for his support of Blackwell's speech. The letter stated that Hodges was acting to restrict civic freedom, a "disservice to both educational quality in our State-supported institutions and to development of the human potential of our State." Hodges responded harshly by saying, "I don't know how smart these people are who wrote that letter, but they apparently aren't as smart as they sound."[25] Hodges's folksy and circular logic in his response was characteristic of the anti-intellectual strain that had periodically gripped North Carolina politics, even though Hodges had attended the state's pre-eminent public university (UNC). The NC State professors also sent a letter to Chancellor Blackwell,

---

[24] Sandra Porter to Luther Hodges, 11 March 1960, Box 523, Folder: "Segregation: Sit Down Situations," Governor's Papers, Luther Hodges, North Carolina State Archives.
[25] Charles Craven, "Professors Attack Hodges' View on Sitdown Protests," *News and Observer*, 25 March 1960, 1, 2.

which said that his advice to the student body at the Woman's College "to refrain from taking such action (no matter how well-intentioned the advice) appears clearly to restrict the civil rights and academic freedom of students."[26]

Whereas many professors and students loathed the action taken by Blackwell, a more nuanced look at his role reveals that he did attempt to call together representatives of Woman's College, Bennett College, Greensboro College, North Carolina A&T, and from the Woolworth and Kress stores. After students initially refused to halt the demonstrations, they agreed to a two-week moratorium. Other negotiations followed, but students resumed protests in Greensboro in early April. In September, Blackwell left Woman's College to become the president of Florida State University. Blackwell took over for Dr. Robert M. Strozier, who had died earlier in 1960. Prior to Blackwell's arrival, six Florida State students had been arrested for taking part in the demonstrations in Tallahassee, and the college placed them on probation with a warning to steer clear of future demonstrations. Florida State officials questioned Blackwell on his racial views before hiring him and evidently were satisfied.[27] Blackwell later oversaw the integration of Florida State when the first three African Americans entered the school in the fall semester of 1962.[28] Hence Blackwell may very well not have been a staunch segregationist. Yet the response among students and professors in North Carolina that questioned his discouragement of students from protesting are indicators of the ways in

[26] Ibid.
[27] Tallahassee UPI, "Blackwell Questioned on His Racial Views," *News and Observer*, 17 August 1960, 22.
[28] Joan Abbott, "Three Negro Students Enroll Here This Fall," *Florida Flambeau*, 5 September 1962, 1.

which ideas about academic freedom provided ideological support for student civil rights activism.

While the sit-ins and protests received some support from the Triangle's largest white colleges (UNC and NC State), they also received support from certain segments of the student body at the state's most prestigious private educational institution, Duke University. On April 15, a group of Duke Divinity School students announced the adoption of two resolutions which opposed racial discrimination and expressed support for the student movement. It should be noted that opposing racial discrimination and supporting the tactics of the demonstrators were two different issues. Some whites favored the former but disapproved of the latter. One part of the first resolution stated that "we identify ourselves with the purpose of the students who are participating in non-violent protestations, and we are in accord with the end for which they are striving, namely the elimination of all racial discrimination."[29] Thus, without explicitly promoting the sit-in tactics, the Duke students nonetheless supported the actions of the student movement to eliminate segregated practices. The second resolution maintained that the "policy of segregated lunch counters, followed by certain local merchants and chain stores is not in harmony with Christian principles." This resolution also recognized the difficult position in which local merchants found themselves, and therefore made a pledge to eat at lunch counters that chose to integrate. Not every Duke Divinity School student supported the resolution, but the vote was overwhelmingly in favor of adoption

[29] "Sitdown Move Commended by Duke Divinity Students," *Durham Morning Herald*, 16 April 1960, 1B.

with ninety-one affirmatives, fifteen negatives, and five abstentions.[30] The vote demonstrated that among whites, support for integration came largely from two segments of the population: college students or faculty, and religious leaders.

Whereas the divinity students demonstrated overwhelming support for integration, the views among the Duke student body as a whole were more divided. The *Durham Morning Herald* pointed out that a plurality of undergraduate men (44 percent) favored a continued policy of segregated admissions, or that is to say, no admissions for African American students. Of course, one must factor in that the poll did not account for graduate students or female students. The reality was that Duke University did not admit an African American student until the 1961 fall semester. Thus, the university itself did not take a leadership role in favoring integration. But certain groups within the student body as well as the faculty played an important role in supporting integration. The most obvious example of white student support at Duke came from those who actually participated in the desegregation demonstrations in downtown Durham. Duke University students joined the sit-in demonstrations with students from NCC, a historically black public institution in Durham. A dozen Duke students, in addition to sixty-three NCC students, two students at Durham Business College, and three African American Durham residents were arrested on trespassing charges in May 1960 when they refused to leave segregated lunch counters.[31]

---

[30] Ibid.
[31] "Tarheel Polls on Desegregation," *Durham Morning Herald*, 15 April 1960, 4; Durham (AP), "46 Negroes, Whites Face Trial After Durham Counter Reopens," *News and Observer*, 7 May 1960, 1.

The response by one Duke faculty member to the arrest of Duke student Lonnie Benton Chesnutt was particularly revealing about the interplay between Duke student activism and college officials' response to direct-action tactics in Durham. In mid-May, Dean of Students Robert Cox dismissed Chesnutt from a housemaster's position for the following academic year due to Chesnutt's participation and arrest for trespassing during sit-ins in Durham. Cox made it clear that his action toward Chesnutt should not be interpreted as the official position of the college, an indicator that the college did not have an official policy for its employees to follow. But after consulting with several students and members of the faculty, Cox decided to change his decision and reinstated Chesnutt to his position.[32] Cox's decision to change his mind reveals several important realities about the situation on college campuses in regards to student sit-ins. First and foremost, attitudes about racial discrimination as well as students' right to protest were fluid and were being challenged in ways that sparked self-reflection by university officials. College administrators throughout North Carolina were being pulled in varying directions by tradition and segregationists on the one side and those in favor of integration and advocates of students' rights to protest unfair practices on the other side. For Cox, who seemed to be unsure of which position to take, a student that had been arrested presented a particularly difficult dilemma and begged an answer to the excruciatingly difficult question of whether a student's pursuit of justice excused his challenge to a segregationist interpretation of the law.

---

[32] Ray Lowery, "Duke Dean Changes Mind About Depriving Student Sitdown Participation," *News and Observer*, 19 May 1960.

The decision by Dean Robert Cox to reverse his punishment for a student activist was clearly influenced by discussions with faculty members and students, but he also likely considered a recent resolution approved by the Duke chapter of the AAUP. The unanimously approved resolution of April 25 condemned the use of academic authority to discipline, suspend, or expel students for peacefully protesting against racial discrimination.[33] Implicit in the denunciation of the use of academic authority to curb protests was an acknowledgment of the students' expanded conception of academic freedom, one that extended beyond the property limits of the campus.

The majority of analysis thus far in this chapter has focused on academic freedom and civil rights protests broadly and as they relate to the response of students and faculty at the "Research Triangle" schools. Some students and faculty from NC State, Duke University, and UNC provided ideological support for, and even practical participation in, the student movement for integration of public accommodations. Yet the backbone of the movements in Raleigh and Durham came from the students and in some cases, faculty and administration, of the historically black colleges in the two cities. NCC president Alfonso Elder had established a tradition of promoting issues related to academic freedom before the sit-in movement developed in earnest in 1960. Even prior to his official inauguration as president in 1949, Elder had made the decision that students needed to become more knowledgeable about democracy. In his fourteen years as president, Elder emphasized the concept of "student self-direction." He maintained that two phases of student self-direction emerged in the late 1940s and the following decades.

[33] Lowery, "Duke Dean Changes Mind."

The first was a concept of independence that emphasized the students' "freedom to initiate and control their own affairs without faculty interference."[34] The second phase emphasized student-faculty cooperation. The two phases overlapped and by the early 1960s, Elder believed that "our experience has led us to conclude that both types are important in an educational institution, that they complement each other, and that they should be provided simultaneously."[35]

NCC student involvement in the sit-in demonstrations in Durham provided what some might term a dilemma for Elder, but one that he embraced as an opportunity. The students had largely acted independent of the faculty and the administration. If Elder wanted to retain any semblance of student respect for his idea that student self-direction and student-faculty cooperation could coexist, he could not abandon the students and discourage them or direct faculty to discourage them. The students had put the concept of student self-direction into action, and in doing so, demonstrated an expanded concept of academic freedom that extended beyond the campus. Elder had three basic options for how to respond to the sit-ins. One was to take a strong stand against them and appease Governor Hodges and many state legislators. Such a move might have sacrificed ethics for the practical concern of not risking state funding for the college. A second option was to remain silent on the issue, which in itself could very well be interpreted as implicit support balanced against a concern for potential loss of funding. A third option was to take a strong stand in favor of the demonstrations. Elder's speech indicated that he

[34] Alfonso Elder, "The Evolution of a Concept of Student Self-Direction," 1, 3, undated, Series 3 (Speeches 1960-1963), Folder 228, Alfonso Elder Papers, James E. Shepard Memorial Library, North Carolina Central University, Durham, North Carolina. Although Elder's speech is undated, it is highly likely that it was delivered in 1960.
[35] Ibid., 6.

pursued the third option, one he largely justified through the concept of student self-direction.

Yet to acknowledge the student right to participate and to encourage faculty support were two different things. Not only did Elder support the students' right to demonstrate, but he also gave indicators that the faculty should support the students. He warned that "it will be a great pity if we who are teachers do not make use of the convictions, the determination, and the dispositions to act in the interest of an idea which this new development in self-direction had produced."[36] In supporting the students' right to demonstrate without discouragement from the college administration, Elder solidified his adherence to a belief in student self-direction. This stance gave him a window through which to justify his support of the student demonstrations and their impact on striving for a more democratic society. His actions provide further evidence that an expanding concept of academic freedom provided strong ideological support for civil rights activism in North Carolina.

The student demonstrators in Durham received immediate support from some members of the community. The Durham Committee on Negro Affairs, which stated that it was unaware of the plans of the NCC students to participate in sit-down strikes (a term used by many in the initial stages of sit-ins), officially endorsed the strategy of the students. In a February 12 letter to Governor Hodges, Committee chairman John H. Wheeler commended the students for the poise they demonstrated while experiencing threats, cursing, and a shower of eggs and stated that the irresponsible elements of the

[36] Elder, "The Evolution of a Concept of Student Self-Direction," 8.

community that had committed such acts "would do well to acquire some of the qualities of good citizenship and understanding which have been shown by those who protest."[37] The letter specifically addressed the concern that the Committee had in regards to certain state officials attempting to call upon African American leaders, including college presidents, to use their influence to halt the activities of the students.

Of course, Hodges had pressure coming from other elements of society that asked him to take a strong stand against the demonstrations. The segregationist group North Carolina Defenders of States' Rights asked the governor to "take any action necessary through the administrations of the Negro schools whose students are now creating social disturbances in the stores throughout the state to remedy this unwholesome and unhealthy social situation." Hodges responded that there was little that he could do about the participation of students at state-supported colleges and noted that "the administration can't tell the boards of trustees what to do in running the schools."[38] Thus, Hodges did not make a concerted effort to use the full force of the governor's office to halt the demonstrations. Yet the following week he endorsed the Blackwell speech that discouraged student participation. On March 11, Elder declined to comment on Hodges' support for the Blackwell speech.[39] Thus in the early stages of the demonstrations in 1960, Elder showed implicit support for the students by not supporting the governor's wishes for college presidents to use their influence to halt the demonstrations.

---

[37] John H. Wheeler to Luther Hodges, 12 February 1960, Box 523, Folder: "Segregation: Sit Down Situations," Governors Papers, Luther Hodges, North Carolina State Archives.
[38] "In Lunch Counter Protests: Moderation Will Prevail-Hodges," *Durham Morning Herald*, 2 March 1960, 1.
[39] Bill Frue, "Official Position of NCC Given: Elder Calls for Negotiations in Sitdown Controversy Here," *Durham Morning Herald*, 12 March 1960, 1B.

Governor Luther Hodges did not understand, or at a minimum did not appreciate, the goals and aspirations of student demonstrators. In my survey, which asked respondents to rate a variety of individuals on their influence in bringing about integration and positive changes in race relations on a scale of one to ten, the student participant average rating for Hodges was a paltry 2.9.[40] Perhaps no other statement by Hodges demonstrated his lack of understanding of the goals of the student movement more clearly than a comment he made at an industrial meeting in Richmond, Virginia. He stated that African nations seeking independence and African Americans seeking integrated service in the United States were similar in that "they want to get freedom but they don't want the commensurate responsibility."[41] His statement neglected the reality that in addition to the goal of being able to eat at lunch counters at stores in which they were able to shop elsewhere in the store (and in many cases allowed to order food but not sit at the lunch counter), many students also had broader goals. They sought further equality of opportunity in a society that denied them the opportunities that they felt their level of education should have provided them. Students from the "Protest Triangle" schools recognized that increased freedoms meant increased responsibility. They demonstrated their intelligence, talents and responsibility in the classrooms on the campus of Shaw, St. Augustine and NCC. But they wanted to be able to more effectively utilize those traits in a society that limited their ability to do so. The governor's statement is one indicator that he was oblivious to their aspirations.

---

[40] See Appendix for survey results.
[41] Richmond, Va. AP, "Hodges Says: Negroes Seek Freedom But No Responsibility," *News and Observer*, 28 April 1960, 36.

Elder had a clearer understanding of the students' aspirations than Hodges and many state political leaders. Although Hodges was no longer governor in 1962, a speech made by Elder in February of that year at a meeting of the National Student Association at Duke University appears to be a fitting response to state political leaders who concurred with Hodges that African Americans sought freedom but not responsibility. Elder pointed out that there had traditionally been a tendency in institutions of higher learning to distinguish between 1) the acquisition of knowledge and 2) the application of knowledge. In the segregated south, students at black colleges acquired knowledge without the commensurate ability to apply their knowledge in the form of jobs that met their educational attainment. Elder held that social activism on the part of students fell into the category of application of knowledge.[42] Seeking to integrate the lunch counters was a step toward further employment opportunities. Thus, Elder seemed to appreciate the reality that many student activists viewed the demonstrations as part of their education.

Ultimately, Elder recognized the importance of an expanded concept of academic freedom in providing support for student civil rights activism. He stated that students and teachers had the right to function in a dual role as members of the school community and as citizens of their respective local communities. He declared that "the second basic right which I shall mention is academic freedom. The one commitment or unalterable position which should be considered the 'proper' commitment for students and teachers in an

[42] Alfonso Elder, "The Responsibility of the University to Society (With Special Emphasis on Student Involvement in Extra-Class Affairs), 25 February 1962, address delivered at Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, Folder 215, Scan 215, p.3-4, Alfonso Elder Papers.

institution of higher learning is the commitment to open inquiry and to the pursuit of truth 'wherever it may lead.'"[43] Elder took a stand that the students' freedom to protest peacefully should not be infringed. Student demonstrators from NCC and other black educational institutions protested a system that limited their social and economic opportunities. Alfonso Elder understood that they sought greater opportunities to *apply* the knowledge that they had acquired. To restrict their activities would have been a clear repression of academic freedom.

Elder's relatively strong stand in support of student demonstrations found support from faculty from the school as well as professors outside of the school. After the first week of sit-ins in Raleigh and Durham, NCC math professor Dr. C. Elwood Boulware endorsed the demonstrations. Even at this early stage, he seemed to appreciate the historic nature of the student actions and claimed that they had moved out of the philosophy of the 1950s and had "intelligently and lawfully employed the techniques of the new leaders of the sixties who are accomplishing something."[44] Boulware's individual endorsement was a courageous step, as it was unclear at that stage what impact public support of the demonstrations might have on his job. By April 1960, there emerged more unified support from the NCC faculty, as 103 faculty and staff signed a statement of support for student demonstrations, which was released by the school's chapter of the AAUP. Boulware was the president of the chapter and he made it clear that the statement did not represent an official position of the college. The position on the sit-in demonstrations was quite clear in the statement, which criticized community

[43] Ibid., 5.
[44] "Durham College Prof Endorses Demonstrations," *News and Observer*, 15 February 1960, 3.

leadership for allowing the patterns of segregation to continue for so long and explicitly stated that the "orderly protests ought to continue as long as opposition to the granting of equal rights is unyielding."[45]

The NCC chapter of the AAUP's reaction to the demonstrations was symbolic of the broader response from the AAUP. Founded in 1915, the AAUP was always on the lookout for violations of academic freedom, and in the wake of the sit-ins, the organization supported the right of students and faculty to participate in the demonstrations. Just as the AAUP chapter of Durham's most influential state-supported black educational institution supported the demonstrations, the AAUP chapter at Duke University gave similar support.[46] Of course, AAUP support at any given college should not be confused with official support from the college. As previously mentioned, Duke University did not allow black student admission (aside from a few foreign black students) until the following year. Nonetheless, AAUP college branches often gave an aspect of formal faculty support for the demonstrations, or at the least an assertion that students should not be punished for their participation in demonstrations. At the heart of these policies was a commitment to an expanded commitment to academic freedom not only for faculty but students as well, one that permitted peaceful civil rights activism.

In 1960, for the first time in its history, the AAUP devoted the majority of its resolutions to concerns over racial discrimination. For example, the association declared that any teacher had the right to belong to any organization working for school

---

[45] "103 at Durham School Sign AAUP Statement on Sit-Downs," *Carolina Times*, 16 April 1960, 2; "NC College Profs Back Picketing," *Durham Sun*, 15 April 1960, 9B.
[46] Ray Lowery, "Duke Dean Changes Mind About Depriving Sitdown Participant," *News and Observer*, 19 May 1960, 18.

integration, a likely response to southern states that banned membership in the NAACP. The AAUP also passed a resolution condemning the expulsion of students from southern colleges for their participation in peaceful demonstrations against racial discrimination. According to the AAUP, colleges that expelled students for peaceful protests exhibited an abuse of academic authority.[47] In some cases, historically black colleges in the South had little choice but to expel students when pressured by state political leaders. For example, in late February 1960, the Alabama state board of education accepted a resolution by Governor John Patterson, which essentially ordered Alabama State College president Harper C. Trenholm to expel nine student demonstration leaders or else face the loss of state funding.[48]

The case of the expelled Alabama State College students is important to an analysis of the protest movement in Raleigh and Durham. For one, it demonstrates the power that governors could wield in states that would accept such an infringement upon academic freedom and freedom of assembly. When viewed in contrast with reactionary governors such as John Patterson, Luther Hodges could viably be considered a "moderate" on racial issues. On a more direct level, the expulsion of the Alabama State students had a direct impact on the historic conference at Shaw University in Raleigh in April 1960 that ultimately led to the creation of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). Eight of the nine expelled students from Alabama were delegates at

[47] Detroit AP, "Professors Rally to Students' Aid," *News and Observer*, 10 April 1960, Sec. II, p.8.
[48] Diane McWhorter, *Carry Me Home: Birmingham, Alabama: The Climactic Battle of the Civil Rights Revolution* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2001), 152.

the conference.[49] One of the primary student leaders among those expelled, Bernard Lee, became prominent in the national struggle in the years to come.

While there were periodic connections between students from black colleges in North Carolina and those from other states, students at the local colleges performed the majority of organization and daily planning. In Raleigh, Saint Augustine's College and Shaw University were different from NCC in one crucial aspect. The two Raleigh schools were private, religious-affiliated institutions, whereas NCC was a state-supported institution. Saint Augustine's College was an Episcopal Church-affiliated institution that was the site of an important conference in 1959. Episcopal clergymen John Morris and Cornelius "Neil" Tarplee called together clergy and other Episcopalians together at the school to form an organization to respond to the nation's growing racial crisis. According to religious historian Gardiner H. Shattuck, Jr., Saint Augustine's was chosen because it was one of the few church-related institutions in the South at which a large interracial group could meet without arousing undue attention from local white opponents. Approximately one hundred people met for the conference in late December 1959. They established an organization called "The Episcopal Society for Cultural and Racial Unity," later known by the acronym ESCRU. The participants adopted a statement of purpose calling for an end to racial criteria in the admission of people to schools, camps, hospitals, and other institutions affiliated with the Episcopal Church.

[49] "Delegates to the Youth Leadership Conference, Shaw University-Raleigh, N.C., April 15-17, 1960," 2 June 1960, Box 25, Folder 1, SNCC Papers, King Library of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Nonviolent Social Change, Atlanta, Georgia.

The statement also called for support for Episcopalians working for integration.[50] Historian Charles W. Eagles argues that ESCRU immediately took a militant stand against segregation and he maintains that it was the first national religious organization to endorse the lunch counter sit-ins.[51]

Thus, Saint Augustine's campus had already been the site of a historic conference in regards to race relations even prior to the extensive student involvement in the direct-action civil rights campaigns of the early 1960s. While support for ESCRU was not unanimous among Episcopalians, it likely gave the president of the college, James Boyer, an additional basis for supporting student civil rights activism. Boyer was born on the campus of St. Augustine's College in 1909, where his father taught and later became the school's first African American dean. The younger Boyer served as a professor of English at the college before serving in the United States Navy from 1942-1946. He was the Dean of the College from 1949-1955 before becoming the president, a position he held until 1967. But it was during his time working on his Ed. D. in English at the University of Michigan that we get a glimpse into some of the ideas that would guide his leadership style. In a paper that he wrote in 1949, titled "Teacher-Administrative Relationships," Boyer criticized Dr. Harold L. Trigg, the first African American president of Saint Augustine's College, for his apparently autocratic leadership style. Boyer pointed out that the AAUP had challenged at least one of Dr. Trigg's decisions for dismissing one of his teachers without sufficient cause. But what is perhaps even more

---

[50] Gardiner H. Shattuck, *Episcopalians and Race: Civil War to Civil Rights* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2000), 100-101.
[51] Charles W. Eagles, *Outside Agitator: Jon Daniels and the Civil Rights Movement in Alabama* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993), 39-40.

telling for how Boyer would approach his eventual role as the president of Saint Augustine's is his criticism of Trigg's relationship with the students. Boyer claimed that under Trigg students had become frustrated by the constant "Thou Shalt Nots" from the president, which caused them to become apathetic because any deviation from the established norms would lead to severe punishment or even expulsion. Boyer cited another scholar, G. Robert Koopman, who argued that an effective administrator should "practice democratic techniques … push others into the foreground of acclaim, and believe that as many as possible should have opportunities to take responsibility and exercise leadership."[52]

Boyer was the president of Saint Augustine's College when students from the college participated in the sit-in movement in 1960. Even at private historically black institutions, college presidents faced a dilemma over how to respond to the new student movement. On the one hand, Boyer likely wanted to live up to his ideal of a college president who would "practice democratic techniques" and the belief that students should have an opportunity to exercise leadership. On the other hand, the sit-ins presented concerns that could potentially result in loss of funding from white donors and African American alumni who may have believed the strategies were too radical. As 1963 graduate and three-sport athlete LaMonte Wyche (Sr.) points out, "It was a fine line" that the college administration had to walk in their response to the demonstrations. One of the people closest to Boyer from a professional standpoint was Millie Dunn Veasey, who was

[52] James A. Boyer, "Teacher-Administrative Relationships," 3, 6, 10, unsorted box labelled "Dr. James Boyer Papers−Mrs. Emma Boyer Correspondence, James A. Boyer Papers, Prezell R. Robinson Library, Saint Augustine's University, Raleigh, North Carolina; G. Robert Koopman, Alice Miel, and Paul J. Misner, *Democracy in School Administration* (D. Appleton-Century Company, Inc., 1943), 3-4.

executive secretary to the president during the period of the sit-ins. Veasey had served in the Woman's Army Corps during World War II and attended Saint Augustine's with funding from the GI Bill. She recalls that Boyer was not directly involved but never made any effort to discourage the students, a recollection that is reinforced by other Saint Augustine former faculty and student interviewees.[53] Veasey herself was involved in the demonstrations and participated in marches, but not sit-ins. She never feared losing her job if she discussed the protests with other faculty or with Boyer. She also discussed the protests with students, and one of those students was her son Warren Veasey, who became the vice president of the Raleigh branch of the Congress of Racial Equality and a movement leader in the second wave of protests in 1963. Thus, Millie Dunn Veasey had a unique position, being close to both the college president and one of the student leaders, and she acknowledges that the student-led groups were the most influential in the sit-in movement.[54]

James Boyer did not take a strong leadership role in promoting integration in public accommodations, but faculty and students that attended Saint Augustine's College and Shaw University in the early 1960s gave him generally high ratings on the survey, which asked them to rank him from 1-10 based on whether he did all he could do within his power to improve conditions for African Americans in Raleigh.[55] According to student and faculty interviewees, the dean of the college, Dr. Prezell R. Robinson (who

---

[53] Millie Dunn Veasey, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 27 June 2016; Helen Chavis Othow, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 13 July 2016; Pete Cunningham, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 21 June 2016; Lamonte Wyche, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 29 June 2016.

[54] Mille Dunn Veasey, phone interview by the author; Gene Roberts, Jr., "A Look at the Negro Student: Thunder on the Campus: Protest on Mainstreet," *News and Observer*, 3 March 1963, sec. III, p.1.

[55] See appendix for composite survey results.

later became president) was more heavily involved. 1963 graduate LaMonte Wyche never forgot Robinson's reminders that "your first responsibility is to prepare." Whereas Robinson in this instance was not referring specifically to protests, these were words of wisdom that could be applied to the demonstrations. Wyche, who was co-captain of the basketball team recalls a time when he discussed the student protests and mentioned his goal of a CIAA basketball championship to Robinson, and Wyche said Robinson's response was chilling and still resonates to this day. The dean's response was essentially, "Yes maybe we will get our freedom and maybe we will win a championship, but if you don't keep your grades up, you won't be here to celebrate it."[56]

One might interpret Robinson's comment as a slight discouragement from becoming involved in the movement, and Wyche indeed avoided the sit-ins but did participate in one protest march as well as participating in other activities to advance the cause of civil rights. But most student protestors recognized that the demonstrations and their education were not mutually exclusive. Wyche recalls that student protestors viewed the demonstrations as part of their education. They would often write position papers in class about the movement and debate civil rights issues in their dormitories. Robinson did not discourage him from participating in civil rights activities or sports, but merely reinforced that it all started with education. Robinson was not restricting Wyche's academic freedom, and indeed, according to Wyche, "academic freedom was assumed" among the students at Saint Augustine's. The administration encouraged them to *think*. Students were also encouraged by some famous visiting speakers such as the

[56] LaMonte Wyche, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 29 June 2016.

civil rights activist and Morehouse College president Benjamin Mays, who told them "you must think for yourself."[57] Implicit in the advice from black educational leaders was that students must make their own choices about how to improve their own futures, and by extension, those of their race.

The implicit support that the college administration gave to students at Saint Augustine's College was similar to that at Shaw University. On November 16, 1951, Dr. William Strassner was inaugurated as the president of Shaw. At his inauguration, former Shaw president W.S. Nelson stated that "the genius of a private institution of learning is to teach the truth, speak the truth without any fear of coercion."[58] Prior to becoming president, Strassner was the dean of religion. Seeking a replacement for the position he previously held, in November 1952 he reached out to a twenty-two year old Boston University theology student, Martin Luther King, Jr. Strassner had previously been a guest minister at Martin Luther King, Sr.'s church in Atlanta. King, Jr. was recommended to Strassner by Dr. Sankey Blanton, the president of Crozer Theological Seminary in Chester, Pennsylvania, from which King, Jr. had received his bachelor of divinity degree.[59] One can only speculate on how the civil rights movement in Raleigh or Montgomery or Atlanta or America in general may have been changed had King decided to accept the position of dean of religion at Shaw. King, Jr. would ultimately come to Shaw University in April 1960 for the conference organized by Ella Baker and sponsored by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

---

[57] Ibid.
[58] Untitled article, *The Crisis*, 59, 1 (January 1952): 52.
[59] William R. Strassner to Martin Luther King, Jr., 18 November 1952, Box 117, Martin Luther King Jr. Papers Project, available online at http://okra.stanford.edu/SearchMLKP_JP.htm

Perhaps no other action demonstrates Dr. Strassner's willingness to embrace civil rights activism more than when he allowed a major meeting of some of the most important civil rights leaders to meet on the campus. Like Boyer, Strassner was given generally favorable responses on the survey asking if he did all in his power to produce positive changes for African Americans.[60] 1960 graduate Vivian McKay stated that the college administration's response to the sit-ins was one of "silent approval," and she also felt that "they were just as excited about it as we were."[61] The student interviewees were in agreement that the college administration and most professors at Shaw were generally in favor of the demonstrations.[62]

Certain faculty members at Shaw played a significant role in civil rights activism. The faculty member most commonly mentioned by student interviewees was the eloquent, wise, and personable Dr. Grady Davis. Student protest leader David Forbes recalled that Davis was very humorous, and if someone asked him how he was doing, he might respond "I am faculty, I have all my faculties, and I am highly functioning." Forbes recalls a time when Davis spoke at a meeting and said, "Folks always ask me what Negroes want…we want everything the white folks got. Even if they got some diseases that we don't have, we want them too."[63] 1962 graduate Louis Powell

---

[60] See appendix for survey.
[61] Vivian (McKay) Camm, interview by the author, digital recording, 27 April 2016, Lynchburg, Virginia.
[62] Vivian Camm, interview by the author; Carrie Gaddy Brock, interview by the author, digital recording, 2 March 2016, Raleigh, North Carolina; Otis Tucker, Jr., mail interview by the author, received 5 May 2016; David Forbes, interview by the author, digital recording, 13 April 2016, Raleigh, North Carolina; McLouis Clayton, interview by the author, 2 March 2016, Raleigh, North Carolina; Louis Powell, interview by the author, digital recording, 13 April 2016, Raleigh, North Carolina.
[63] David Forbes, interview by the author, digital recording, 13 April 2016, Raleigh, North Carolina.

characterized Davis as a "true activist."[64] But even a highly respected advocate for civil rights like Grady Davis acted more as a counsellor and worked in an advisory role when it came to student sit-ins. While student respondents do not recall Davis participating in sit-ins, he was at Cameron Village on February 13, 1960, the day after the forty-one students were arrested outside of the F.W. Woolworth store. Students continued their protests that day, resulting in two arrests, and police told Davis and his two passengers, Dr. O.L. Sherrill and Rev. John W. Fleming, that they would have to leave the parking lot or face trespassing charges.[65]

Other faculty members also offered encouragement for the protests, and some even discussed them in class. The topic was most likely to be brought up in social science classes. 1961 Shaw graduate and student protest leader Albert Sampson recalls talking a lot about black history in Charles Robson's class, in which he required students to read John Hope Franklin's classic historical work *From Slavery to Freedom*. Dr. Wilmoth Carter also discussed the protests in her classes and gave support to the student demonstrators. 1960 graduate Carrie Gaddy (Brock) reiterated that social science/history professors would discuss the protests and their historic nature. "That was right in keeping with history. They could see the far-reaching changes better than we could."[66]

In some cases, professors gave tangible support to the demonstrators. Elizabeth Coffield was a teacher in the school of education at Shaw. She discussed the demonstrations and encouraged the students. But she had a connection to another

---

[64] Louis Powell, interview by the author, digital recording, 13 April 2016, Raleigh, North Carolina.
[65] "Village Official Orders Two More Students Arrested," *News and Observer*, 14 February 1960, 1, 2.
[66] Albert Sampson, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 12 July, 2016; Carrie Gaddy Brock, interview by the author.

important figure outside of the campus. Her husband James E. Coffield was bail bondsman and would bail the students out of jail.[67] At both of the historically black private colleges in Raleigh, students received some theoretical foundations, emotional and spiritual encouragement, and even some practical support for their actions in the direct-action movement in the city. Yet, one point remained clear. This was a student-led movement, and the primary action and leadership remained with the students. As 1960 Shaw graduate McLouis Clayton noted, "Adults were supportive of the movement, but the students were the action people."[68] Just as the students understood that they were ultimately responsible for their own educational success, they also realized that they were the ones that needed to take the leadership role in local civil rights activity.

In order to understand the interrelation between civil rights activism and an expanded vision of academic freedom, one must account for the reality that many student demonstrators viewed their involvement in civil rights activities as part of their education. On a survey asking early 1960s "Protest Triangle" students to rate on a scale of 1-10 (with 1=strongly disagree and 10=strongly agree) based on the statement "Students viewed participation in the movement as a part of their education, and as a way of opening societal opportunities," the average response was 8.25.[69] The true value of education is not only obtaining knowledge, but also the capacity to apply that knowledge in a variety of settings, including potential job opportunities. African American job opportunities were limited in both the public and private sector in the South and

---

[67] Albert Sampson, phone interview by the author; David Forbes, interview by the author; Carrie Gaddy Brock, interview by the author; "Village Official Orders Two More Students Arrested," *News and Observer*, 14 February 1960, 1, 2.
[68] McLouis Clayton, interview by the author.
[69] See appendix for survey.

throughout much of America at the beginning of the 1960s. While the sit-ins were not necessarily directly aimed at improving job opportunities for African Americans, the challenge to segregated seating at lunch counters was a step toward the destruction of a society deeply rooted in segregation. In some cases, protests against segregated eating facilities coincided with protests against hiring and employee promotion discrimination. Just as a student seeks high grades and a quality education largely in order to increase their opportunities in society, so were student demonstrators attempting to tear down barriers to their opportunities in society and the economy.

Louis Powell was one of those students at Shaw University whose participation in the demonstrations had broader goals than simply being able to eat at a lunch counter. According to Powell, "I just wanted to see change. I wanted to see opportunities open for everyone."[70] He wanted to see further opportunities opened in state employment, as he felt that becoming a teacher was about the only practical option for an African American in North Carolina to obtain a decent job. Powell realized that Research Triangle Park was just opening up in that time period. Perhaps no other project in North Carolina better demonstrated the potential that the combined resources of state and local governments, the business community, and important educational institutions could bring for job opportunities in the Triangle. And no other group of people was more influential in eventually opening those types of opportunities than the students that initiated a more aggressive challenge to segregation. Powell recalls that those "industries that were coming in [were] offering tremendous opportunities to people, but those opportunities

[70] Louis Powell, interview by the author.

were not open to blacks. I just felt like we deserved or had earned the right to be considered for activities there also."[71] In Raleigh and Durham, the students at the "Protest Triangle" schools generally believed that their education had prepared them for increased societal opportunities. The sit-ins and other forms of student protest were a step toward that goal.

For those students at the "Protest Triangle" schools who viewed civil rights demonstrations as part of their education, any attempt to thwart those activities could conceivably be viewed as an attack on their academic freedom. At the two private historically black colleges in Raleigh with primarily black faculty and administration, it might be expected that student participation would not be discouraged. Vivian McKay (Camm) said that she "could not conceive of the college telling us not to" participate in civil rights demonstrations.[72] Fellow Shaw graduate Carrie Gaddy (Brock) said that "academic freedom played a big part because the president viewed us as young adults capable of making our own decisions."[73]

The students at the historically black colleges who showed tremendous organization and discipline in the 1960 sit-ins were indeed capable of making their own decisions about their strategies and goals for the movement. They had taken the primary leadership role in the local movements, and their actions received support from national groups that defended academic freedom, such as the AAUP. The student protestors' actions also mobilized support from some students and faculty at the Research Triangle

[71] Ibid.
[72] Vivian Camm, interview by the author.
[73] Carrie Gaddy Brock, interview by the author.

schools, many of whom defended the students' right to protest as part of their academic freedom.

Whereas the student protestors appreciated the encouragement and counselling from respected professors and other college officials on their own campuses and beyond, they were cognizant of the reality that the movement was student-led. At the historic conference on the campus of Shaw University in April 1960, students from the "Protest Triangle" and many other schools in the South would make important decisions on the future strategy of the movement. For nine weeks, Shaw had been the hub of civil rights activism in Raleigh. And for three days in the heart of spring, it would be the epicenter of a blossoming regional and national movement.

CHAPTER IV

THE "PROTEST TRIANGLE" AND THE 1960 YOUTH LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE AT SHAW UNIVERSITY

The late winter of 1960 was an exceptionally cold and snowy time in Raleigh and other parts of North Carolina. Shaw University student Carrie Gaddy (Brock) recalls that the snow and ice did not deter the students from making the trek downtown to participate in sit-ins. She also remembers a time when a white bystander set a few bullets on the lunch counter where the black students sat.[1] Similar incidents of intimidation toward black protestors were common, as were verbal assaults. The sit-ins came to Raleigh on February 10, 1960, nine days after the brave actions of the "Greensboro Four" and two days after they had spread to Durham stores. An egg flew across the room at the lunch counter at F.W. Woolworth in Raleigh and splattered on several of the African American students, yet they remained unfazed. According to *The News and Observer*, approximately 150 students from Shaw University and St. Augustine's College participated in the demonstrations that day at seven stores in downtown Raleigh and at the Woolworth store in Cameron Village, a shopping center approximately three miles from the Shaw University campus in downtown Raleigh. Students from all three of the "Protest Triangle" schools participated in Raleigh that day, as Samuel T. Gibson, a North

[1] Carrie Gaddy Brock, interview by the author, digital recording, 2 March 2016, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Carolina College at Durham (NCC) student visiting a friend at St. Augustine's also joined in the protests.[2]

Students from the "Protest Triangle" schools were instrumental in pushing the sit-in movement forward in North Carolina in 1960. Several of these students also participated in the historic conference at Shaw University on Easter weekend in April. But the conference that ultimately led to the creation of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee did not represent the beginning of their activism. This chapter will show that a burgeoning student leadership had already emerged at the "Protest Triangle" schools prior to the conference, and that the strategies and philosophies that were discussed at the conference mostly reinforced those that had already been promoted by the student leadership at Shaw University, Saint Augustine's College, and North Carolina College at Durham (NCC). Perhaps the most newsworthy aspect of the conference was the presence of several established civil rights leaders, including Martin Luther King, Jr. But more importantly, the conference was emblematic of the reality that in 1960, it was students from historically black colleges that were pushing the civil rights movement forward most forcefully. The conference was indispensable in establishing connections among activists in North Carolina and throughout the South and further emboldened student leaders who by April 1960 were already becoming the vanguard of the civil rights movement.

My analysis of the adult leaders at the April conference will not lose sight of the fact that the sit-in movement in 1960 was a student-led movement. Established civil

---

[2] Charles Craven and David Cooper, "Student Sitdown Strike Spreads to Stores Here," *The News and Observer*, 11 February 1960, 1, 23.

rights leaders such as Ella Baker, Martin Luther King, Jr., and James Lawson played important roles at the April conference at Shaw. But the most significant aspect of the conference was the congregating of students from many cities who had already participated in a new phase in the civil rights struggle. Thus, this chapter begins with an analysis of student activism in the "Protest Triangle" and the leadership that was blooming in the late winter and early spring of 1960. From an ideological and moral standpoint, students from historically black college campuses acted as a counter to established local and state political leadership who generally supported segregation. And in a literal sense, as student participants in Raleigh proceeded from Saint Augustine's College and Shaw University to segregated eating establishments downtown and in Cameron Village, they went from campus to counter.

The lunch counters at all of the places in which sit-ins occurred on February 10 in Raleigh were temporarily closed. The students continued their protests the following morning, and downtown stores followed different strategies to get them to leave. At S.H. Kress, about fifteen students sat at the lunch counter, which was in the basement of the larger store. Employees turned off the lights and the demonstrators left. The lunch counters at F.W. Woolworth, Walgreen's Drug Store, and McLellan's on Fayetteville Street remained closed from the previous day, and at Walgreen's a large sign read, "Closed in the Interest of Public Safety," which mirrored a common sign throughout the segregated South in the coming months.[3]

[3] Charles Craven, "Sitdown Scene Peaceful: Lunch Counters Closed," *The News and Observer*, 12 February 1960, 1, 2.

Most of the protest activity in Raleigh in 1960 occurred in the downtown stores on Fayetteville Street, a street that is bookended by the state capitol and the Memorial Auditorium, which is adjacent to the Shaw University campus. But one of the most important events in the history of the sit-ins came at Cameron Village in Raleigh on Friday, February 12, 1960. Protestors from Shaw University and St. Augustine's College had staged sit-in demonstrations at the F.W. Woolworth Store the previous two days, but the actual arrests on February 12 came mostly on the sidewalk around the store. William Worth, the vice president of Cameron Village, Inc., stated that he asked the students to leave and proceeded to flag down a passing police patrol wagon. Worth said that the group of protestors was orderly, but he asked them to leave as a matter of public safety. "I simply asked them to leave the private premises of Cameron Village…. I do the same thing with white youths when they congregate in front of the drug store."[4] Shaw student Cornell Adams maintained that he was making a phone call from a phone booth in front of Woolworth when he was told he had two minutes to leave the area. Adams was heading toward a street when an officer arrested him and told him his "two minutes were up." Police arrested forty-one protestors on February 12, but protests continued the following day with picketing outside of the segregated stores and two more arrests for trespassing.[5]

The forty-one arrests on February 12 were the first arrests in North Carolina in 1960 related to student-led civil rights demonstrations. The strategy of "filling the jails"

---

[4] Raleigh (AP), "Raleigh Hits Sitdown Moves With Arrest of 41 Negroes: Students Charged With Trespassing," *Durham Morning Herald*, 13 February 1960, 1; Charles Craven, "Police Arrest 41 in Raleigh Demonstrations: Trespassing is Charged in Village" *The News and Observer*, 13 February 1960, 1, 2.
[5] "Village Official Orders Two More Students Arrested," *The News and Observer*, 14 February 1960, 1, 2.

was not generally employed in Raleigh in the 1960 demonstrations, in contrast to the larger demonstrations that emerged in greater strength throughout North Carolina and the South in 1963. Yet the arrests were significant to the movement even in 1960, as many students viewed an arrest as a "badge of honor" and a symbol of their commitment to the cause of freedom. Glenford E. Mitchell, a student protestor and editor of the *Shaw Journal* campus newspaper, wrote in 1962 that "when our few on the Shaw University campus got together and decided to add our bit to the history of the movement, we had no idea that our actions would transform the jails of the South from dungeons of shame to havens of honor."[6] Carrie Gaddy Brock recalls that for her Shaw classmates who participated in the movement, "jail was not a dirty word."[7] The student participants had been taught by their parents most of their lives that they should never go to jail, but the sit-ins had brought a new perspective among the students and even some of their parents. As Saint Augustine's College student Pete Cunningham recollected, "That year was a break from the past." Challenging unjust laws and social practices was a key aspect of civil disobedience. Yet it should be pointed out that the college students in Raleigh generally did their best to avoid jail in the 1960 demonstrations. Cunningham recalled that in the instances in which store managers called the police, the demonstrators would leave when asked to do so by the police. Even Shaw University student protest leader

[6] Glenford E. Mitchell, "College Students Take Over," in Glenford E. Mitchell and William H. Peace, eds., *The Angry Black South* (New York: Corinth Books, 1962), 75.
[7] Carrie Gaddy Brock, interview by the author.

David Forbes was only arrested once for his involvement in the demonstrations. He felt that he could not afford to get arrested again after his first arrest on February 12.[8]

The arrests on February 12 were also important in strengthening an emerging group of student leaders from Shaw University and Saint Augustine's College. One of the most important student leaders in Raleigh was 1962 Shaw graduate David Forbes. Forbes attended the historic conference at Shaw in April 1960 that ultimately led to the creation of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and was one of the two initial North Carolina student representatives of SNCC, along with Charles Jones of Johnson C. Smith University in Charlotte. But even before the conference at Shaw, Forbes had emerged as a dynamic leader in the student movement in Raleigh. While SNCC became a crucial organization in promoting the sit-ins in the early 1960s, it did not even exist during the initial wave of sit-ins in North Carolina and was considered a temporary organization until October 1960. It is much more accurate to assert that the somewhat amorphous yet determined leadership that emerged among student protestors at historically black colleges provided the initial foundation for SNCC rather than vice versa. Forbes attended three SNCC conferences in 1960, but his primary contribution to the movement remained as a local leader in Raleigh. Historian Peter Ling has pointed out that the minor scholarly attention given to Forbes is not commensurate with his repeated presence at SNCC conferences because he forged a local career in Raleigh. Ling maintains that "the vast majority of individuals who attended SNCC events did not remain active within SNCC or emerge as nationally acknowledged protest figures more

[8] Pete Cunningham, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 21 June 2016; David Forbes, interview by the author, digital recording, 13 April 2016, Raleigh, North Carolina.

generally."[9] The lack of scholarly attention on Forbes is likely due to a tendency among some scholars (but certainly not all, as Ling's work demonstrates) to focus on studies of organizations and their impact on the movement. Any analysis of an individual such as Forbes should emphasize the significance he had in the local movement and the importance that a wide variety of individuals had on him, rather than simply attributing his significance to belonging to an organization.

Another important student demonstrator that was arrested on February 12 was Leslie Camm. He and Otis Tucker, Jr. had been co-captains of the football team at Dunbar High School in Lynchburg, Virginia, and part of the reason they came to Shaw was to play football. Student athletes were often used as a defense against potential violence directed at protestors. Even though the protestors were expected to remain nonviolent, the presence of football players could help deter angry whites from inflicting physical violence on the demonstrators. David Forbes recalled that "we got the football team to be our buffer" at the protests.[10] Fellow 1962 Shaw graduate Louis Powell remembered that "it always made you feel a little bit better to be in the group when you had an offensive lineman from the football team there or the linebackers there, somebody at 310 or 290, that helped a whole lot. When I went to McLellan's to sit-in at the booth there, if I had somebody 290 pounds there with me, I'd feel pretty good."[11] Saint Augustine's students had a much longer walk to get downtown than those from Shaw.

---

[9] Peter Ling, "SNCCs: Not One Committee, but Several," in Iwan Morgan and Philip Davies, eds., *From Sit-Ins to SNCC: The Student Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2012), 89.

[10] Vivian (McKay) Camm, interview by the author, digital recording, 27 April 2016, Lynchburg, Virginia; David Forbes, interview by the author.

[11] Louis Powell, interview by the author, digital recording, 13 April 2016, New Hill, North Carolina.

Students from "St. Aug" often walked in a pattern in which the women were in the middle of a row or on the inside (away from potential attackers) on their way to Shaw or to the downtown stores.[12]

The strategic ways in which demonstrators marched downtown was not unique to Raleigh. On February 6 in Greensboro, the North Carolina A&T football team, with American flags in hand, "formed a flying wedge" that moved through groups of white hecklers to pave the way for activists to reach the lunch counters.[13] Evidently a white youth asked the demonstrators, "Who do you think you are?" One football player responded, "We the Union Army." Historian Iwan Morgan acknowledges that the army reference may not be a perfect metaphor for a nonviolent movement but contends that the response linked the past to the present. Morgan contends that "just as the Confederacy ultimately had to concede defeat to a militarily superior foe, the segregationist South's failure to suppress the sit-in protests ultimately ensured its own defeat by a morally superior foe."[14] Furthermore, the actions of the football teams from North Carolina A&T, Saint Augustine's, and Shaw revealed that African American men were displaying a manhood that was often stripped from them throughout American history.

Another Shaw football player arrested on February 12 was Otis Tucker, Jr. He continued with the protests in the weeks following his arrest. He was at the scene when Otis Clark was struck with a chain on February 17 and witnessed Clark respond with a devastating punch to the white offender. Tucker claims that the white man got the worst

---

[12] "Let Us March On: Raleigh's Journey Toward Civil Rights," (Raleigh: Raleigh City Museum, 2000), 32.
[13] Simon Hall, "The Sit-Ins, SNCC, and Cold War Patriotism," in Morgan and Davies, eds., *From Sit-Ins to SNCC*, 137.
[14] Iwan Morgan, "The New Movement: The Student Sit-Ins in 1960," in Morgan and Davies, eds., 18.

of the altercation and was the one that was arrested.[15] The twenty-five-year-old white man, who had a previous arrest for an altercation with his mother-in-law, was sentenced to sixty days for the incident with Clark. Tom Ellis, the judge that sentenced the man, stated that "the time has not come yet when the white citizens of this town must act as vigilantes and take the law into their own hands."[16] The judge's statement is notable in two regards: in one sense, he seems to imply that there *may* come a point when white vigilantes should take the law into their own hands. On the other hand, it is quite remarkable that Clark was not charged and the white man was. It is difficult to imagine such an outcome in any state in the Deep South. Regardless of the court verdict, Clark continued in the protest movement. His reaction to the chain incident was not consistent with the nonviolent approach of the student movement in Raleigh, which otherwise maintained its nonviolent discipline. Indeed, the previous day, a female protestor was slapped by a white man. One of the Shaw student leaders, Cornell Adams, evidently had to talk some football players out of retaliating.[17] For Adams and other student leaders, the lack of retaliation did not reveal a lack of courage, but rather, a strong show of discipline.

While some male protestors demonstrated their manhood, female protestors proved that they were capable of social activism in a public setting. More than a third of those arrested on February 12 in Raleigh were women. Many women took leadership roles in planning the demonstrations, and women were heavily involved in the actual

---

[15] Otis Tucker, Jr., mail interview by the author, received 5 May 2016.
[16] "Student's Attacker Gets 60-Day Term," *The News and Observer*, 19 February 1960, 1, 22.
[17] "Students Carrying Signs Picket at Raleigh Stores," *The News and Observer*, 17 February 1960, 1; Mitchell, *Angry Black South*, 77.

demonstrations. 1961 Shaw graduate Vivian McKay (who later married 1962 graduate Leslie Camm) served as a demonstrator and organizer. She participated in two sit-ins, including one at Kress in which an egg was tossed and landed near her. She recalls that when the student protestors arrived, store employees would have a look on their faces as if to suggest, "here they come again." After the egg incident, she chose not to participate in any more sit-ins, as she was concerned that she would fight back if provoked. She was invigorated that the students were taking action, and her decision to stay away from the actual sit-ins did not mean she was completely removed from the movement, as she continued to help organize and assisted in making protest placards. There was also a personal element to becoming involved in the movement. While most of the participants agree that there was no coercion for students to become involved, there was some social pressure. Vivian remembered some social pressure to become involved because Shaw was such a small, close-knit campus and the students were "buzzing" about the movement. "If you were not involved, you were not a part of the conversation" at dances and other social events.[18] Civil rights demonstrations unified the student body at Shaw and Saint Augustine's like no other force in 1960.

A system of "reciprocity" existed between Shaw University and St. Augustine's College both in academic cooperation between the colleges, but also among civil rights activists attending the institutions. The arrests made on February 12 were emblematic of the direct action movement in Raleigh in the sense that there was a high degree of cooperation between students at the two historically black colleges in the city. The

[18] Vivian Camm, interview by the author.

institutions had a "reciprocal arrangement" in which certain classes at either institution were open to students from the other.[19] And a type of reciprocity existed between civil rights activists at the two schools as well. St. Augustine's College freshman Barbara Woodhouse was among those arrested on February 12 at Cameron Village. The previous night, Woodhouse and a group of other St. Augustine's students met at Shaw University to plan out the event for the following day. They agreed on how to dress and how to behave, a common practice throughout the era of the sit-ins in Raleigh and elsewhere. St. Augustine's students often went to Shaw prior to the demonstrations to review strategy. Students commonly referred to their movement as the "Shaw-St. Augustine's Student Movement." Several different committees existed, including the aptly named "Intelligence Committee," an idea advanced by Shaw student Cornell Adams. The group included five students from Shaw and four from St. Augustine's. Shaw Student Council president Albert Hockaday took on a significant leadership role in the first few weeks of the Raleigh sit-ins. He distributed blank forms to students on which they indicated when they had free time. According to Glenford E. Mitchell, the early leadership in the Raleigh movement was not elected, but rather, came to being after the second day of demonstrations in Raleigh (February 11).[20] Despite the several important figures in the student movement in Raleigh, the reality was that there was no clear, undisputed leader on either of the historically black campuses in early 1960. It was a group-centered

[19] *Saint Augustines' College Ninety-Third Catalogue, 1959-1960*, Vol. 65, No.3, 38. http://library.digitalnc.org., accessed 23 February 2016.
[20] Mitchell, *Angry Black South*, 75-79.

dynamic, an approach that would sit well with the most influential figure of the conference at Shaw in April 1960, Ella Baker.

The sit-in movement in Durham was similar to Raleigh in the sense that the backbone of the movement came from African American students. The bulk of the protestors came from NCC, but students from Durham Business College, Hillside High School, and DeShazor Beauty School (which apparently gave extra credit to students who participated) also participated in the demonstrations.[21] Among the most essential protest leaders from NCC were Lacy Streeter, Robert Kornegay, and Callis Brown. Kornegay was the Student Government President for 1959-1960, a position that Streeter would hold the following year. These three students were instrumental in organizing the initial 1960 sit-ins in Durham on February 8. The plan for the sit-in was advanced at a meeting at the "Freshman Bowl" on the NCC campus. At the meeting, the detailed plans for the demonstrations were revealed, which stated that the protestors would adhere to nonviolence and accept any abuse from opponents. Streeter assured the students that the protests would get results. He claimed that the sit-downs would be "hurting the cash register, and when you hurt the cash register, you are bound to get results."[22]

On February 8, seventeen NCC students and three white Duke University students conducted a sit-in at Woolworth's until the counter was "closed in the interest of public safety." From there they went to Kress store, which closed minutes after their arrival. When the students went to Walgreen's, they found the seats filled by whites, and thus, the

---

[21] Christina Greene, *Our Separate Ways: Women and the Black Freedom Movement in Durham, North Carolina* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 78.
[22] Willie G. Hall, "Students Stage Sit-Down Protest: Results Unknown On Negotiations," *Campus Echo (North Carolina College at Durham)*, 19, 6 (26 February 1960): 1, 4.

group returned to the NCC campus.[23] After the demonstrations, Kornegay stated that "this thing has been planned for some time and these groups have just come into the picture recently."[24] The groups to which Kornegay was referring were the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), and the Durham Committee on Negro Affairs. Whereas the February sit-ins in Greensboro were not organized by established civil rights organizations, there had been discussion of the tactic at statewide NAACP meetings prior to the emergence of protests in 1960. In the fall of 1959, participants at a statewide NAACP youth conference urged adult leadership to take a more aggressive approach to integration and even discussed "sit-down strikes in eating places such as bus and train stations and dime stores." But at a late January 1960 NAACP meeting, the adult leadership decided that voter registration would be their focus for the year.[25] Thus, even though the sit-ins were seemingly spontaneous student demonstrations sprouting from Greensboro, there is evidence to suggest that had the "Greensboro Four" not initiated the new phase in the movement, the sit-ins may have been pushed ahead by students from other historically black colleges.

After the initial 1960 sit-ins in Durham on February 8, there was not another in the city for nearly three weeks. Protestors gave a chance for an agreement to be worked out between an NCC committee and the Durham Human Relations Committee. Lacy Streeter said that the demonstrations continued in late February because students did not

---

[23] Ibid., 4.
[24] Bill Frue and George Lugee, "Woolworth and Kress Close Lunch Counters Temporarily: Two Stores Open For Other Sales," *Durham Morning Herald*, 9 February 1960, 1.
[25] Greene, *Our Separate Ways*, 76.

expect much to come of the negotiations, and that they would "chart their own course of action in the protest."[26] The failure of city leadership and black adult leadership to negotiate a settlement with business leaders and a resumption of sit-ins was a common pattern in many cities in 1960, a pattern that would re-emerge in the following four years. Student leaders were rarely represented at these meetings, and when they were, it was not in proportion to their influence in the movement for integrated public accommodations. As in most other cities in which sit-ins occurred, the primary student leadership did not just give instructions but participated in the actual demonstrations themselves, inviting the same dangers and insults that other participants faced. On February 29, Callis Brown was spit on by a white girl, who was summarily arrested for assault and battery, another indicator that police in the Triangle were fairer than those in the Deep South.[27]

The movements in Raleigh and Durham shared many similarities, and in some cases there was interaction between activists in the two cities. Both cities had active branches of the NAACP, and the historically black colleges had college chapters of the NAACP. Lacy Streeter was the president of the North Carolina College chapter of the NAACP. This position put him in contact with NAACP executive secretary Roy Wilkins and afforded Streeter many opportunities to extend his influence beyond Durham. In mid-March, Streeter attended a conference with leaders of the organization in New York City. On the same trip, he spoke to students in Syracuse, New York, and was one of

[26] "Student Demonstrations Continue in Durham: Picket Stores: Negotiators Get Statement Ready," *Carolina Times*, 5 March 1960, 1.
[27] Bill Frue, "Two White Teenagers Are Arrested in Sitdown Here: Negroes Picket Stores," *Durham Morning Herald*, 1 March 1960, 1.

those to speak in front of over two thousand people at a mass rally in Detroit, Michigan.[28] Two weeks prior to the trip, Streeter appeared on NBC's "Today Show" on March 1 to show support for the demonstrations. Streeter stood in stark contrast to another member of the panel, Raleigh lawyer and staunch segregationist I. Beverly Lake. The show aired on the same day that Lake launched his bid for governor of North Carolina.[29] It was a rare moment, one in which perhaps the most outspoken voice for segregation in North Carolina in 1960 was in the room with an influential student leader who represented the student demonstrators, who were the most important group in challenging segregation.

Both Raleigh and Durham had eloquent and effective student protest leaders. But the movement in Durham was distinct from Raleigh in 1960 in some ways. For one, the students in Durham received a higher degree of support in the form of actual participation of white students, especially those from Duke University and even from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Four white Duke students participated in the first 1960 sit-ins in Durham on February 8. When sit-ins hit the Howard Johnson's restaurant on the Chapel Hill Boulevard on March 2, ten of the approximately thirty protestors were white students from Duke University and the University of North Carolina.[30] When forty-six protestors were arrested for trespassing charges after refusing to leave S.H. Kress in Durham on May 6, thirty-two were North Carolina College students, four were sympathetic African American citizens, and ten were Duke University students.

---

[28] "Streeter Makes Northern Tour," *Campus Echo*, 19, 7 (31 March 1960): 7.
[29] New York (UPI), "On Television Program: Lake Sees Chaos and Confusion If Restaurants Are Integrated," *The News and Observer*, 2 March 1960, 10; Charles Clay, "Lake To Run: Sounds Segregationist Theme," *The News and Observer*, 2 March 1960, 1.
[30] John Langston, "30 White and Negro Students Join in Demonstration-Invade Howard Johnson's," *Durham Sun*, 2 March 1960, 1A.

Trespassing arrests due to sit-ins on May 11 at the same Kress store included three Duke students as well.[31] The importance of participation by white students was not limited to the increase in the actual numbers of protestors. Just as black students challenged the myth that African Americans were content with segregation, white student involvement shattered the myth of a monolithic southern white population that favored segregated practices.

Durham was also distinct from Raleigh in the sense that Durham had sit-ins prior to the emergence of sit-in demonstrations as a regional movement in 1960. While the 1957 sit-ins at the Royal Ice Cream Parlor in Durham have already been discussed, it is important to reiterate that those demonstrations were not fully supported by many prominent African Americans in Durham. The Durham Committee on Negro Affairs did not support these initial sit-ins. As historian Christina Greene points out, the NCC chapter of the NAACP was unhappy with the Durham Committee on Negro Affairs' refusal to support a publicity campaign against segregated theaters in 1958.[32] While the Durham Committee on Negro Affairs was an important organization in promoting the rights of African American citizens, there were reasons for students to be critical of its lack of urgency in some instances. The ideological and moral force of the sit-ins in Durham in 1960 was too clear for the Committee to ignore.

An important factor in pushing the Durham Committee on Negro Affairs toward supporting the activities of the sit-ins was the visit to Durham by the Reverends Martin

---

[31] George Lugee, "46 Arrested Here at Kress' Lunch Counter," *Durham Morning Herald*, 7 May 1960, 1, 12; "Cops Arrest 57 Here in Food Service Case," *Durham Morning Herald*, 12 May 1960, 1.
[32] Greene, *Our Separate Ways*, 75.

Luther King, Jr. and Ralph Abernathy. The Reverend Douglass Moore of Asbury Temple Methodist Church in Durham was instrumental in getting the two men to come to the city. A crowd of twelve hundred to fifteen hundred crowded into the White Rock Baptist Church for a rally on February 16. Reverend Moore addressed the crowd and asked them to be part of a "mass and mammoth attack on segregation."[33] Moore also asked how many of the people at the rally would be willing to forego new Easter outfits to help finance the work of challenging segregation. Moore asked people to stand up if they were willing to support a boycott of the stores that maintained segregated lunch counters.[34] Nearly all those stood up to demonstrate their dedication to such a strategy. In addition to the call for a boycott of segregated stores, the most important part of the day's activities was the support that was given for the student sit-ins in North Carolina and throughout the South. Martin Luther King, Jr. began his speech by saying, "Victor Hugo once said that there is nothing in all the world more powerful than an idea whose time has come." King continued, stating that "you students of North Carolina have captured this dynamic idea in a marvelous manner. You have taken the undying and passionate yearning for freedom and filtered it into your own soul and fashioned it into a creative protest that is destined to be one of the glowing epics of our time." Thus, even in the early stages of the sit-ins, King seemed to recognize the historic nature of the protests and their importance to the broader struggle for black freedom. King also urged the demonstrators to "not fear going to jail. We must say we are willing and prepared to fill

---

[33] "King Leads Rally, Urges Nonviolent Crusade: Negroes Hint of Boycott Here," *Durham Sun*, 17 March 1960, 1, 2.
[34] Ibid.; "King Stresses Non-Violence in Lunch Counter Sitdowns," *Durham Morning Herald*, 17 February 1960, 1, 2.

up the jails of the South."[35] Thus, from an early point in the new phase of the movement, King demonstrated his willingness to support an aggressive strategy that had been put into practice by the young activists.

Yet the demographics of the crowd at White Rock Baptist Church on February 16 were somewhat revealing. According to *The News and Observer* of Raleigh, the majority of the crowd was thirty years old or older.[36] These may indeed have been the people that needed direction from King to support the student sit-ins. The student demonstrators themselves had already committed to the new strategy, and the forty-three protestors in Raleigh had already been arrested. While King's support for the sit-ins was significant, one should not overemphasize his role in sustaining the direct action tactics of the 1960 sit-ins. It was a student-led movement that gained support and encouragement from important and well-known civil rights leaders such as King and Abernathy, not vice versa.

King's visit to Durham was also significant in revealing the ways in which segregated businesses were attempting to limit media coverage of the demonstrations. During the afternoon of February 16, King and Abernathy toured the dime stores in downtown Durham where sit-ins occurred, and had their pictures taken. An assistant manager at one of the stores demanded they leave. A store employee made a rush at one of the cameramen, and he ran away from his pursuer. Sensing the volatile situation, King and Abernathy left the scene. Television cameraman Ed Gray was on his way out of the

---

[35] Martin Luther King, Jr., "A Creative Protest: American Students in the Struggle for Freedom," speech given in Durham, North Carolina, 16 February 1960, Series III, Box 1, Folder: "A Creative Protest," King Papers, King Library of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Nonviolent Social Change, Atlanta, Georgia.
[36] Gene Roberts, Jr., "Negro Leader Urges Students to Continue Segregation Protest," *The News and Observer*, 17 February 1960, 1, 2.

door when a policeman attempted to confiscate his camera. An African American cameraman, C.C. Burthey, was initially detained by police and store officials until an African American lawyer advised them that his film could not be confiscated without a warrant. Jim Thornton, a *Durham Morning Herald* photographer, was chased for nearly a block by a store official until he reached the safety of the *Herald* office.[37]

Thus, King's visit to Durham was quite eventful, as it brought further attention to the sit-in struggle in the Triangle and North Carolina in general. The store employees likely recognized the influence that King had in vastly increasing media coverage of the movement against segregation. On February 16, some of the news media covering King's visit were literally on the run. In a more figurative sense, the new aggressiveness of challenging segregation sparked by the 1960 sit-ins revealed a broader truth that proponents of segregation would be on the run in the coming months and years. Of course, the true die-hard proponents of segregation would dig in their heels, but many previous supporters of segregation began to increasingly question the ethical and practical implications of segregation. The pressure to reconcile the ostensible American ideals of equality and freedom with Southern traditions that rejected these values was mounting in early 1960. That pressure grew due to an increasingly aggressive generation of activists who were nascent yet inspired, youthful but wise, idealistic but logical. These young activists would begin to solidify their goals and strategies when Dr. King returned to the Triangle in the middle of April for the historic conference at Shaw University.[38]

---

[37] Ibid.

[38] Gene Roberts, Jr., "Negro Leader Urges Students to Continue Segregation Protest," 1, 2; David Forbes, interview by the author.

The Reverend Douglas Moore had been instrumental in getting Martin Luther King, Jr. to come to Durham in February 1960. The primary organizer of the 1957 sit-ins in Durham, Moore would also play a prominent role in the development of leadership that resulted from the new wave of sit-ins in North Carolina and throughout the South. On February 21, 1960, Moore hosted at his home approximately thirty students from historically black colleges in Raleigh, Durham, Fayetteville, and Greensboro. Moore reported a bomb threat to his Asbury Temple Methodist Church by a woman claiming to be a member of the Ku Klux Klan, a threat that was likely the result of the meeting at Moore's home. While the students agreed at the meeting to continue the protests until they were successful, Moore said the strategy would be left up to the local leaders in each city. The participants agreed that they would "adopt the technique of nonviolent resistance as our primary method of protest and persuasion to win converts to the causes of equality and opportunity, freedom of assembly and freedom of speech on a nondiscriminatory basis in every avenue of life in our native land."[39] In many ways, the meeting at Moore's home was a precursor to the larger meeting of students at Shaw University from April 15-17.

The primary organizer of the April 15-17 meeting at Shaw University was Ella Baker. By 1960, Baker had decades of experience in activism and organizing. In 1931, Baker had been elected to serve as the national director of the Young Negroes' Cooperative League (YNCL), a coalition of local cooperatives and buying clubs that were part of a loose network of councils throughout the United States. In her excellent

[39] "Negro Leaders to Continue Café Segregation Protests," *Durham Morning Herald*, 23 February 1960, 2.

biography on Baker, Barbara Ransby points out that the YNCL, whose founding statement included an emphasis on gender equality and the principle that young people should be in the forefront of the struggle for social change, represented the type of grassroots democracy and group-centered leadership that Ella Baker advocated throughout her career.[40] In 1936, Baker began a stint with the Workers Education Project of the Works Progress Administration, where she sought to make consumer education available to African Americans. Her approach to consumer education in the 1930s might very well have applied equally to the students at the historically black colleges who participated in the sit-ins: "the aim is not education for its own sake, but education that leads to self-directed action."[41] In the 1940s, Baker worked for the NAACP. Ransby contends that the organization's lack of mass mobilizations and grassroots organizing led her to resign her position.[42]

At the time that Ella Baker was organizing the meeting of student leaders to be held at Shaw University, she was the executive director of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. In this position, she was arguably the third-ranking official in the organization behind King and Abernathy. But by early 1960, Baker had already planned to leave the organization, largely based on her differences of opinion with King and her concern that SCLC failed to operate as a "group-centered leadership, rather than a leadership-centered group."[43] Perhaps Baker's words from 1968 best exemplify her

---

[40] Barbara Ransby, *Ella Baker and the Black Freedom Movement: A Radical Democratic Vision* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 83.
[41] Ransby, *Ella Baker and the Black Freedom Movement*, 91, 93, 95.
[42] Ibid., 142.
[43] Joanne Grant, *Ella Baker: Freedom Bound* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1998), 123.

approach: "I never worked for an organization but for a cause."[44] And in early 1960, Baker knew that student activists had greatly contributed to the cause of black freedom, and that they should play the prominent role in determining the direction of the direct-action movement. Thus, when she came to Raleigh and Durham on March 16, 1960 to work on agreements for the student conference, she had a conviction that students retain their autonomy. This conviction was shared by a young North Carolina College and Boston University graduate, Douglas Moore. At a meeting of Baker, Moore, and a white Fellowship of Reconciliation member Glenn Smiley, the three decided that adults would serve mostly in an advisory capacity at the Shaw meeting and "speak only when asked to do so."[45] Thus, as the planning for the meeting at Shaw was taking place, Baker demonstrated her commitment to allowing the students to take the leadership role in the conference.

While Baker's goal for a youth-centered conference formed the foundation for her strategy, she began the important task of working out the practical details. She secured $800 from SCLC, no small amount for a relatively new organization that had been established in 1957. She also secured Raleigh's Memorial Auditorium, a literal stone's throw from the edge of the Shaw Campus for the public mass meeting on April 16. The mass meeting was co-sponsored by the Raleigh Citizens Association (RCA), a group that was revitalized in the wake of the student sit-ins. The executive secretary of the RCA was none other than the dynamic dean of the Shaw school of religion, Dr. Grady Davis.

---

[44] Ransby, *Ella Baker and the Black Freedom* Movement, 209.

[45] Ella Baker memorandum to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and Rev. Ralph Abernathy, 23 March 1960, Box 32, Folder 10, SCLC Papers, Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Nonviolent Social Change, Atlanta, Georgia.

Davis was one of members of the Shaw faculty that Baker spoke with in regards to the practical details of the conference, along with University Secretary Demetrious Keck, Business Manager John V. Anderson, and President William Strassner. Baker also noted in her March 23, 1960 memorandum to King and Abernathy that the Dean of Saint Augustine's College (Prezell Robinson) and the student leadership pledged to cooperate on housing for the conference. Ultimately, several of the participants also lodged at the Bloodworth Street YMCA.[46]

Shaw University was a logical choice as a host for the April conference. Just as Saint Augustine's College had been a wise choice for the 1959 conference that ultimately produced the Episcopal Society for Cultural and Racial Unity, Shaw was a sound choice for the April 1960 conference due to the relatively lower concern over violence that might come if it were held in the Deep South. Shaw was the oldest historically black campus in the South and played a prominent role in the student sit-ins in Raleigh. Additionally, Raleigh was somewhat centrally located to pull students from southern and northern schools. But perhaps the biggest consideration for Baker was that she herself was a Shaw alumna. She graduated in 1927 as class valedictorian and was one of the two students who spoke at the commencement.[47] Baker thus had connections with citizens in Raleigh, and she ultimately lodged with fellow Shaw alumna Effie Yeargan, who had been one of the founders of the RCA.[48]

---

[46] Ibid. In the SCLC document cited here, Ella Baker references "Mr. Alexander, Business Manager." This was a minor error on her part, as the Business Manager at Shaw University was John V. Anderson. See *The Bear* (Shaw University Yearbook), 1961, 15.
[47] Ransby, *Ella Baker and the Black Freedom* Movement, 63.
[48] Grant, *Ella Baker*, 127.

One of the most important aspects of planning the conference centered on who to invite. Baker invited several student government presidents from historically black colleges. She also scanned newspaper accounts and wrote to student leaders. Among many others, the list included all of the "Greensboro Four" group, as well as North Carolina College students Lacy Streeter and Callis Brown.[49] Baker sent a letter to potential student participants asking that they send a brief account of eight to ten pages describing the protest activities that had occurred at their college and in their communities.[50] As always, Baker took into account the various personal and community stories that were shaping the movement for black freedom. Throughout her work as a civil rights organizer, she demonstrated a concern for the actual activists who carried the movement. These qualities would serve her well at the Youth Leadership Conference on Nonviolent Resistance held at Shaw University.

For nearly a century, the Shaw campus had been the site of an institution that improved the opportunities of African Americans through education. For three days in April 1960, Shaw became the center of the civil rights world, as both established leaders and burgeoning leaders met on the campus. Just as many of the student protest leaders from historically black colleges were honored by *Who's Who Among American Colleges and Universities*, the April conference was a sort of "Who's Who" of the civil rights movement, as many of the attendees were active in the movement before and after the conference. Among those in attendance were Martin Luther King, Jr., Ralph Abernathy,

---

[49] "Persons Written to Regarding Youth Meeting," 5 April 1960, Box 25, Folder 1, SNCC Papers, Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Nonviolent Social Change, Atlanta, Georgia.
[50] Ella Baker, "We Need Your Story" (letter to several protest leaders), Box 25, Folder 1, SNCC Papers, Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Nonviolent Social Change.

Ella Baker, Wyatt Tee Walker, Fred Shuttlesworth, James Lawson, Diane Nash, James Bevel, Bernard LaFayette, Julian Bond, Charles Sherrod, Bernard Lee, Marion S. Barry, Charles McDew, and Ezell Blair, Jr.[51]

Accompanying North Carolina A&T student and "Greensboro Four" participant Ezell Blair, Jr. to the conference was the lone delegate from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, David Dansby. Dansby was one of the few black students at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC) in 1960. In a sense he benefitted from the groundbreaking entrance to the UNC School of Law by four students in 1951, including Floyd B. McKissick, Sr., the lawyer who would represent Dansby a few years later when he was arrested for his involvement in civil rights demonstrations. When Dansby came to Chapel Hill as a freshman in 1957, black undergraduates had only been attending the University for two years. He recalled his experience at UNC, stating that "I was pretty much a pariah, since I was outspoken."[52] During his time at UNC, he would often go to NCC to hang out with black students in order to "maintain my sanity…. I was over there all the time. Some people thought I was a student there."[53] Although he finished his undergraduate work in 1961, Dansby continued as a graduate student until 1964. He became increasingly involved in civil rights demonstrations in Durham. As a student at UNC, as a protestor in Durham, and as a delegate at the Shaw conference, Dansby represented a direct link between a "Research Triangle" school and those of the "Protest Triangle."

---

[51] "Delegates to Youth Leadership Conference," 2 June 1960, Box 25, Folder 1, SNCC Papers, Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Nonviolent Social Change; "Students Set Up: Southwide Group To Direct Battle," *The News and Observer*, 18 April 1960, 1.
[52] David Dansby, phone interview by the author, 14 June 2016.
[53] Ibid.

Dansby and Blair, Jr. shared a commitment to improving social and economic conditions for African Americans. They had also attended the same high school, Greensboro's Dudley High. Historian William Chafe makes clear the contributions that teachers at Dudley High School made in breaking racial barriers. Ezell Blair, Sr., a teacher at Dudley, had led an effort in 1959 to pressure merchants at a shopping center to employ African American salespersons in "nontraditional" jobs. Chafe's work repeatedly reveals the contributions of teachers like Nell Coley, who "instilled a sense of pride and provided a model of strength."[54] Thus Blair, Jr. and Dansby took their various experiences in high school and their respective colleges with them to the Shaw conference, as did the other student participants. Dansby's participation in the conference was revealing in his experiences and the ways in which he perceived the proceedings. Like many other male participants, he stayed at the Bloodworth Street YMCA. He did not realize going into the meetings that there would essentially be a choice between the students becoming a sort of youth arm of the SCLC or creating a new student-led organization. He did not sense any tension at the meeting but also felt that Ella Baker's inclination toward leadership was different than King's. Dansby believed at that time that the students should follow Dr. King but later came to believe that Baker's ideas about leadership were more beneficial. "I think they were right and I was wrong," he recalled.[55] Dansby was cognizant of the tremendous leadership potential that existed among the students at the conference. Among these was a protest leader at Johnson C.

---

[54] William H. Chafe, *Civilities and Civil Rights: Greensboro, North Carolina and the Black Struggle for Freedom* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), 80.
[55] David Dansby, interview by the author.

Smith University in Charlotte, Charles Jones, and a student that Dansby characterized as outspoken and articulate, Shaw University's David Forbes.[56]

Forbes had been instrumental in the initial phase of the demonstrations in Raleigh. He had helped organize a meeting at Greenleaf Auditorium on the Shaw campus to organize the first sit-ins in Raleigh in February 1960. According to Forbes, he was on a committee assigned by President William Strassner to work out details for accommodations and hospitality for the conference. Forbes was one of eight Shaw students who were delegates for the April conference. Others included Charles Sparks, David Walker, Fred Marshall, Albert Hockaday, Eleanor Nunn, Glenford E. Mitchell, and Howard Edward Anderson.[57] But Forbes points out that many more Shaw students participated in some capacity in the conference or attended the mass meeting at the Memorial Auditorium on April 16. Several Shaw faculty members were also encouraging of the students at the conference, including Elizabeth Coffield, Wilmoth Carter, Charles Robson, Horace Davis, and perhaps the most supportive member of the faculty, Grady Davis.[58]

Like other participants, Forbes attended the session meetings at the conference, which were held on the Shaw campus and local churches. The workshops had a moderator, and many of the sessions were practical rather than deeply theoretical, with some involving practice in picketing and enduring abuse.[59] The sessions had a student chairperson and an adult counsellor. Among the more notable adults counsellors of the

---

[56] Ibid.
[57] "Delegates to Youth Leadership Conference," 2 June 1960, Box 25, Folder 1, SNCC Papers, Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Nonviolent Social Change.
[58] David Forbes, interview by the author.
[59] Ibid.

workshops were James Lawson, Ella Baker, Wyatt Tee Walker, Ralph Abernathy, and Fred Shuttlesworth. Among the notable student chairpersons of the sessions were Johnson C. Smith University protest leader Charles Jones and a critically important student leader from Fisk University, Diane Nash.[60] The workshop chaired by Charles Jones was titled "Inter-racial Thrust of Movement: Encouraging White Persons to Join Movement." This session discussed what type of help the students desired from white supporters and concluded with a recommendation that the "movement should not be considered one for negroes but one for people who consider this a movement against injustice" Participants at this session also articulate that the movement "will affect other areas beyond 'service,' such as politics and economics."[61] The issue of including whites was also brought up in Group 3, which was titled "Techniques of Nonviolence." One of the notes said that sit-ins in which the demonstrators only filled every other seat at a lunch counter were more effective as this would "allow the white public to demonstrate their willingness to eat or demonstrate with the Negroes."[62] Other notes in this session revealed the frustrations that protestors had already encountered in many cities, as one pointed out that "Bi-racial committees appointed by the mayor are usually not useful because they do not represent person involved," and the ensuing note stated that "cooling of [sic] periods should only be used when the movement gets out of hand and takes on

[60] "Workshops," Box 1, Folder 1, SNCC Papers, Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Nonviolent Social Change.
[61] "Group IV," Box 1, Folder 1, SNCC Papers, Martin Luther King, Jr, Center for Nonviolent Social Change.
[62] "Group III," SNCC Papers, Box 1, Folder 1, Martin Luther King, Jr, Center for Nonviolent Social Change.

violent aspects."[63] It is quite clear that students brought their experiences with them to the conference. In many ways, the sessions were merely refining the methods that student protestors had already adopted in their respective cities.

Another major topic at the conference, and one that was documented in Workshop 7, was the question as to whether students would be bailed out of jail or if fines would be paid. The participants of Workshop 7 made their position quite clear, stating that "the members of this group recommended that no bail be posted nor fines paid," in order to "1) Solidify the Negro Community 2) Mobilize public opinion 3) Weaken the opposition by showing that a threat of arrest cannot deter us."[64] Many of the students had already been arrested as a result of the protests, but the topic of going to jail was nonetheless a difficult one to navigate. Students were understandably concerned about the impact that going to jail could have on their future. But Martin Luther King, Jr. had already expressed his support for the students' willingness to go to jail, as evidenced in his February 16 speech in Durham when he stated that "maybe it will take this willingness to stay in jail to arouse the dozing consciousness of our nation."[65]

The presence of Martin Luther King, Jr. at the conference was notable for several reasons. By 1960, King was already well known and was a hero to many African Americans. His presence made the conference a newsworthy event, and television cameras were set up to capture some of the scenes. He had given his support to the sit-in tactics at an early stage, and he reiterated his support in his statement to the press that

---

[63] "Group III," SNCC Papers, Box 1, Folder 1, Martin Luther King, Jr, Center for Nonviolent Social Change.
[64] "Group 7," SNCC Papers, Box 1, Folder 1, Martin Luther King, Jr, Center for Nonviolent Social Change.
[65] "King Leads Rally, Urges Nonviolent Crusade: Negroes Hint of Boycott Here," *Durham Sun*, 17 February 1960, 1, 2.

opened the conference. He stated that the opponents of justice were well organized and that the students must become organized as well. And he suggested that "the students must seriously consider training a group of volunteers who will willingly go to jail rather than pay bail or fines." King also pointed out the importance of reconciliation, ending his press statement by noting: "Our ultimate end must be the creation of the beloved community. The tactics of nonviolence without the spirit of nonviolence may indeed become a new kind of violence."[66] King thus was providing guidance to the students and was demonstrating his talent for expressing his support for an aggressive tactic while simultaneously soothing the concerns of some potentially sympathetic whites and conservative African Americans.

The interaction between Martin Luther King, Jr. and Ella Baker and the seeming contrast in their leadership styles has received extensive analysis from several scholars and civil rights activists. In her biography of Ella Baker, former SNCC member Joanne Grant argues that "King saw the need to mobilize the masses, but he did not understand the need to organize them. Baker did her best to try to nudge him into an organizer."[67] Barbara Ransby makes clear the differences in approaches between Baker and King and the reasons for Baker's frustrations with King. She emphasizes Baker's focus on group-centered leadership that conflicted with King's approach. Additionally, she maintains that King was focused on how the movement was perceived externally and the impact of those perceptions on SCLC, while Baker was more concerned with developing potential

[66] Martin Luther King, Jr., "Statement to the Press by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. at the Beginning of the Youth Leaderships Conference," 15 April 1960, Series III, Box 1, Folder titled: "Statement to the Press at the Beginning of the Youth Conference, Raleigh, North Carolina," King Papers, Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Nonviolent Social Change.
[67] Grant, *Ella Baker*, 4.

leaders than worrying about the organization's eminence.[68] But perhaps Baker's own words indicate the source of tension that suggests that she believed King did not view her as an equally important contributor: "After all, who was I? I was female, I was old. I didn't have no Ph.D."[69]

King and the SCLC leadership respected Baker, but in addition to some of their strategic differences, there was also a significant difference in age. Andrew Young, who was working with the National Council of Churches in 1960, but eventually became one of King's most trusted allies, called Ella Baker the "Momma Superior," due to her many years of experience in the movement but also because she took a sort of "mother role." He maintains that "she tried to do it with Martin and Wyatt Walker and SCLC, it really didn't work. And it was an age problem." Young makes it clear that despite their respect for each other in certain ways, "Martin and Ella Baker didn't get along. And Wyatt Walker and Ella Baker didn't get along, because it was like having your mother in your dorm room."[70] The irony that presented itself at the April 1960 Shaw conference was that the elder Baker was the one who seemed to be most in tune with the aspirations of the younger generation. Young points out that Baker got along with the students because they were younger, and "they needed her wisdom. The thirty year olds didn't want anybody's wisdom."[71]

The underlying strategic and generational tensions manifested themselves among the adult leadership at the Shaw conference. On the second day of the conference, Baker,

---

[68] Ransby, *Ella Baker and the Black Freedom Movement*, 178, 250.
[69] Ibid., 173.
[70] Andrew J. Young, interview by the author, digital recording, 18 May 2016, Atlanta, Georgia.
[71] Ibid.

King, Abernathy, and Walker met at the home of the Shaw president William R. Strassner. In *The Making of Black Revolutionaries*, former SNCC member James Forman points out that the SCLC leaders (with the exception of Baker) tried to convince Baker that the students should become an arm of SCLC. They believed they could procure the votes for such a move, with King delivering student votes from Georgia, led by Lonnie King; Abernathy delivering the vote from the Alabama group, led by Bernard Lee; and Walker securing support from the Virginia delegation.[72] According to Baker's version of the story, she criticized the ministers for trying to "capture" the student leadership and walked out of the meeting.[73] Historian J. Todd Moye maintains that the SCLC leadership should not have been surprised by Baker's commitment to allowing the students to determine their own course, especially because of her previous statement that the adults should only act in an advisory capacity. Moye argues: "If they honestly expected her to prioritize the organization's interests ahead of those of the long-term movement as she understood them, they had not been paying much attention to her over the years."[74] But Moye also points out that the reports of SCLC's attempt to "capture" the student movement may have been overblown, pointing to King's press statement at the beginning of the conference that emphasized "the need for some type of continuing organization."[75] The extent to which King desired such a "continuing organization" to fall under SCLC leadership remains a matter of interpretation. It was initially a goal of

---

[72] James Forman, *The Making of Black Revolutionaries* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1972), 216-217.
[73] Ransby, *Ella Baker and the Black Freedom Movement*, 243.
[74] J. Todd Moye, *Ella Baker: Community Organizer of the Civil Rights Movement* (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2013), 112, 113.
[75] Moye, *Ella Baker*, 113.

King, Abernathy, and Walker, but the fact that they did not fully use their influence to push for such a course may indicate that they appreciated the students' right to chart their own course.

Whereas a good amount of scholarship has focused on the leadership of the Shaw conference, the primary gap in the historiography of the conference remains in how the students themselves viewed the conference. The disagreements among the adult leaders at the conference were not made evident to the students. As previously mentioned, David Dansby does not recall any sense of tension at the meetings and remembered that the students were "just so enthusiastic to be there."[76] Regardless of how students viewed the goals and leadership approaches, they were excited to have the chance to meet some of the most important civil rights leaders, such as Dr. King. David Forbes recalls that King "was so calm and self-confident and warm that you were not intimidated by him. You were inspired by his rhetoric, but you were not intimidated."[77] Forbes did not personally know any of the students that came from outside of North Carolina prior to the conference, and he was not aware of who Ella Baker was. But at the conference he found her to be nurturing, almost like a mother. He recalls that she got to know all of the students and warned them not to allow adults to undermine the student-led movement. In the following summers while working in New York City, Forbes would visit Baker at her apartment on Lennox Terrace. It was during their conversations that Forbes learned of

[76] David Dansby, interview by the author.
[77] David Forbes, interview by the author.

her disagreements with King. But at the Shaw conference, the tensions between Baker and King were not evident to Forbes.[78]

Many of the Shaw University students did not have a true sense of the historic nature of the conference. Surprisingly, some of the students from Shaw and Saint Augustine's do not recall a major "buzz" on campus prior to the conference, whereas others do. The conference was held on Easter weekend, and many of the students travelled home or visited friends or relatives. For those that had participated heavily in the movement, there was an awareness of the conference, but few recognized its historical significance. 1960 Shaw graduate McLouis Clayton did not attend the conference and acknowledged that "the event was much bigger than I thought at the time."[79]

It may have been difficult for many student protestors to fully comprehend the historic nature of the conference, as well as their role in the sit-in movement, but most realized that they were struggling for more than just the ability to sit at lunch counters. In an article that appeared in the May 1960 edition of the *Southern Patriot*, Ella Baker reiterated some of the themes that she addressed in her speech at the conference. Baker started the article by claiming that the "Student Leadership Conference made it crystal clear that current sit-ins and other demonstrations are concerned with something much bigger than a hamburger or even a giant-sized coke." She declared that black and white students in the North and the South were seeking to end racial discrimination not merely at lunch counters, but in all aspects of society. Baker further pointed out the reality that

[78] Ibid.
[79] McLouis Clayton, interview by the author, digital recording, 2 March 2016, Raleigh, North Carolina.

many communities in the South "have not provided adequate experience for young Negroes to assume initiative and think and act independently" and that this "accentuated the need for guarding the student movement against well-meaning, but nevertheless unhealthy, over-protectiveness."[80] Herein lays one of the primary reasons students were drawn to Baker. She recognized that students had a desire to take leadership and that the sit-ins had provided them a chance to exhibit that leadership, but also seek changes in society to improve their future opportunities. Baker realized that the students had already demonstrated their ability to lead the movement in the right direction and wanted to make sure that they would not cower to adult leaders that in her estimation had failed to produce significant changes in the past.

The legacy of the Shaw conference was multifaceted. It helped foster the development of a youth leadership that was already emerging on various campuses. On the final day of the conference, the participants decided to form a temporary Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. The "Recommendations" of the "Findings and Recommendations Committee" were not very detailed, but in addition to creating the temporary committee, it proposed that "nonviolence is our creed," and that the conference endorsed the movement and the "practice of going to jail rather than accepting bail."[81] The conference participants also produced a statement of purpose, which emphasized the commitment to nonviolence. Perhaps the most telling portion of the statement read: "The redemptive community supersedes systems of gross social

[80] Ella Baker, "Bigger Than a Hamburger," *Southern Patriot*, 18 (1960): 4; Forman, *The Making of Black Revolutionaries*, 217-218.
[81] "Recommendations of the Findings and Recommendations Committee Are As Follows," Box 1, Folder 2, SNCC Papers, Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Nonviolent Social Change.

immorality."[82] This brief sentence reveals a commitment to non-cooperation with unjust laws and a devotion to civil disobedience.

The creation of the temporary Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee at the Shaw conference was reinforced at the October 14-16 meeting in Atlanta, at which SNCC took on the form of a permanent organization. SNCC went on to become one of the most vital organizations in the black freedom movement and was perhaps the most effective group in conducting community organizing efforts in the South in the early and mid-1960s. But the legacy of the April 1960 Shaw conference was not simply the creation of a new organization. Rather, it was the reinforcement of a student leadership that was already coming into prominence before the conference began, as well as the establishment of connections among activists in different cities. It is important to remember that in many cities, sit-ins had already occurred and local leadership had already emerged well before the conference took place. According to David Forbes, the conference impacted strategies in Raleigh "mostly by the reinforcement and learning that we were on the right road because basically most of the cities and states were having the same experience."[83]

Aside from Baker and Martin Luther King, Jr. perhaps the most influential adult leader at the conference was James Lawson. Lawson was born in Pennsylvania and attended Baldwin-Wallace College in Ohio. During the Korean War, Lawson was a conscientious objector, and his refusal to serve in the military landed him in prison. But

[82] "Statement of Purpose," April 17, 1960, Box 1 Folder 1, SNCC Papers, Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Nonviolent Social Change.
[83] David Forbes, interview by the author.

one of the most significant experiences for Lawson in his eventual role as a leader in the civil rights movement was the three years he spent as a missionary in India, where he also studied Gandhian nonviolence. Historian Clayborne Carson argues that of all the participants at the Raleigh conference, Lawson was the most versed in the doctrines of nonviolent direct action. In the late 1950s, Lawson put his knowledge into practice by conducting workshops on nonviolence for the Nashville Christian Leadership Council. After enrolling as a theology student at Vanderbilt University, Lawson conducted a workshop in 1959 that drew student participants who would go on to become seminal figures in the movement, including Diane Nash, Marion Barry, John Lewis, and James Bevel. Later that year, the group staged test sit-ins. Although their attempt to achieve voluntary integration by the business owners failed, their efforts would continue the following year.[84]

The connection between the sit-in movement in Nashville and that in the Triangle, however, did not begin at the Shaw conference. According to Lawson, the spark that set off the February 1960 sit-ins in Nashville was a telephone call on February 10 from the Reverend Douglass Moore of Durham, in which Moore asked him "if there was anything the students over here [in Nashville] could do to show their sympathy for the North Carolina sit-ins."[85] The following night approximately fifty students met at Fisk University in Nashville to discuss the possibility of sit-ins, and the Nashville sit-in movement began two days later with heavy participation from Fisk University and

---

[84] Clayborne Carson, *In Struggle: SNCC and the Black Awakening of the 1960s* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981), 22.

[85] "Call Sparked Sit-ins: Lawson: Carolina Friend Asked Sympathy Show, Report Quotes Minister," *Tennessean*, 21 March 1960, unknown page, Series IV, Box 7, Folder: "Banner Clippings," Nashville Public Library Civil Rights Collection, Nashville, Tennessee.

Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State University (Tennessee State University today) students.[86] It is highly likely that the Nashville sit-ins would have eventually occurred regardless of whether Moore had called Lawson and encouraged them or not, but the impact of the call further demonstrates the important role that Moore played in the sit-in movement in North Carolina and beyond.

In conjunction with his extensive knowledge of the philosophy of nonviolence and in his practical application of its tactics, Lawson brought to the conference a similar approach to that of Ella Baker in terms of leadership. In mid-March, approximately halfway between the beginning of the sit-in movement in Nashville and the Shaw conference, Lawson reflected by stating: "What was my role? I was not the leader. My understanding of the Christian non-violence concept is that you don't have a single leader but group leadership."[87] Like Baker, he recognized the importance of allowing local leadership to develop. Of course, there were students that played a more important role than others. One of the most significant student protestors in Nashville was Diane Nash, who also participated in the Shaw conference. According to Barbara Ransby, by the time of the Shaw conference, Nash had already challenged the mayor of Nashville at a press event, delivered speeches to large crowds, and given interviews to the national press.[88] In the week following the Shaw conference, Nash delivered perhaps her most shining moment (among many) in the movement. Following the bombing of black attorney and integration advocate Z. Alexander Looby's home, Nash was at the forefront of a silent

---

[86] "Call Sparked Sit-ins: Lawson: Carolina Friend Asked Sympathy Show, Report Quotes Minister," *Tennessean*, 21 March 1960, unknown page, Series IV, Box 7, Folder: "Banner Clippings," Nashville Public Library Civil Rights Collection, Nashville, Tennessee.
[87] Ibid.
[88] Ransby, *Ella Baker and the Black Freedom Movement*, 247.

march that culminated in her asking Mayor Ben West whether he believed it was wrong to discriminate against a person based solely on their race or skin color. West had undoubtedly grappled internally with such a question previously, and in this crucial moment, he responded by saying he did not believe it was right. Nash's leadership in this historic moment presaged her later civil rights activism, including in the Freedom Rides. According to Ransby, Nash arrived at the Shaw conference looking for reassurance and affirmation, and Ella Baker provided both.[89] The questioning of Mayor West in the week following the conference revealed that Nash had fully emerged as a leader in her own right, a role that had been buoyed by her experiences at the Shaw conference and by the guiding influence, but certainly not the directing influence, of Ella Baker and James Lawson.

In addition to the fostering of student activism, Reverend Lawson brought with him to the Shaw conference an experience that demonstrated the connections between civil rights activism and academic freedom. Lawson had been an ordained minister since 1952 and was one of 5 African Americans among 130 divinity students at Vanderbilt University in 1960. He was a senior when he was expelled on March 3 for his leadership in the sit-ins in Nashville.[90] The reaction at the predominantly white school was mixed. The student senate passed a resolution supporting the university's action in expelling Lawson, stating that the university "could not stand aside in the face of Lawson's strong commitment to civil disobedience." But the president of the student body of the divinity

[89] Ransby, *Ella Baker and the Black Freedom Movement*, 246.
[90] Little Rock AP, "Ousted Lawson Urges More Demonstrations," *Tennessean*, 10 April 1960, 1, 6, Series IV, Box 7, Folder: "Banner Clippings," Nashville Public Library Civil Rights Collection.

school, Gene Davenport, declared that the university's action was "legally right but morally wrong."[91]

Lawson received early support from part of the faculty, when 111 faculty members, including 12 department heads, released a statement that was sent to Mayor Ben West's biracial peace committee and to the heads of all of Nashville's colleges and universities. The declaration stated that "we are distressed that recent actions by Vanderbilt University may be interpreted as condoning the denial of rights of Nashville Negroes to speak and act lawfully in their cause, or of sympathetic individuals at Vanderbilt or elsewhere to support and defend them by word or deed."[92] The statement ultimately expressed sympathy and support for the demonstrations and their efforts to secure equal rights. Among the Vanderbilt professors who signed the statement was a white professor, Charles E. Roos, whose mother was an important figure in the Fellowship of Reconciliation, as was Lawson. Roos recalls that the Vanderbilt faculty was very much split on the issue, with about half in favor of the university's action and half opposed.[93] Support for Lawson was strong in the Divinity School, and fourteen of the sixteen faculty members had resigned in protest by the end of the spring semester. Ultimately, Lawson chose to enter Boston University Divinity School.[94] But at the time of the Shaw conference, Lawson shared a similar story with many of the student participants. He had a deep commitment to nonviolent direct action and had been

---

[91] "VU Group Urges Race Tolerance," *Tennessean*, 9 March 1960, 1, Series IV, Box 7, Folder: "Banner Clippings," Nashville Public Library Civil Rights Collection.
[92] Ibid.
[93] Charles E. Roos, interview by Kathy Bennett, 3, 14, Series III, Folder: "Roos, Charles E," Nashville Public Library Civil Rights Collection.
[94] "Vanderbilt Univ. Faculty Quits Over Negro Student's Ouster: Two Graduates Return Degrees To Tenn. School," *The Carolina Times*, 1A, 6A.

directly involved in sit-ins. Like the expelled students from Alabama State, he also experienced the reality that involvement in civil rights activities pushed the limits of how certain colleges would draw the line on the civic and academic freedom of its students.

The thirty-one-year-old Lawson was the same age as Martin Luther King, Jr. at the time of the Shaw conference. According to Adam Fairclough, Lawson's role in the Nashville sit-ins and his expulsion from Vanderbilt had made him a hero in the eyes of the students. Fairclough argues that it was not only his grasp of Gandhianism, but also his blunt and radical language that made him so popular, including his appeals to a "nonviolent revolution" that could "transform the system." Lawson was instrumental in the adoption of the "Statement of Purpose" of what eventually became SNCC.[95] Perhaps his most enduring legacy was the impact that he had on the Nashville group, including John Lewis, Diane Nash, and James Bevel, but also on the students present at the Shaw conference. But the most newsworthy aspect of Lawson's involvement in the Shaw conference and its aftermath was his criticism of the NAACP. Lawson insisted that the NAACP was too conservative and that its magazine, *The Crisis*, was the "magazine of the black bourgeoisie."[96]

Adam Fairclough argues that the relationship between SNCC and the NAACP never really recovered from Lawson's critical remarks at the conference, in which he criticized the "overreliance on the courts" and the "futile middle-class technique of

---

[95] Adam Fairclough, *To Redeem the Soul of America: The Southern Christian Leadership Conference and Martin Luther King, Jr.* (Athens, Georgia: The University of Georgia Press, 1987), 64-65.
[96] "Students Set Up: Southwide Group To Direct Battle," *The News and Observer*, 18 April 1960, 1.

sending letters to the centers of power."[97] Of course, SNCC did not exist prior to the conference, and thus there was never really any inter-organizational relationship from which to recover. While criticism of the NAACP would be common in the following years among SNCC activists, it is important not to paint the NAACP in one monolithic stroke. Indeed, the NAACP was changing as a result of the increased emphasis on direct action that resulted from the sit-ins. The national NAACP fully encouraged the actions of the students, and on February 11, 1960, executive secretary Roy Wilkins sent a telegram to the national presidents of F.W. Woolworth and S.H. Kress indicating the organization's support of the student protests and calling for an end to stores' "outmoded" policies.[98] After an initial meeting was cancelled due to snowy conditions, National Youth Secretary Herbert L. Wright met with student leaders in Durham to plan strategy after the February 16 speech by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. The students met at St. Joseph A.M.E. Church and outlined plans to effectively coordinate the demonstrations. Kelly M. Alexander, the president of the North Carolina Conference of NAACP Branches, addressed the students and pledged the full support and resources of the state branch. At the meeting, North Carolina College junior Lacy Streeter was elected chairman of the newly created State NAACP Special Coordinating Committee.[99] Streeter had already established himself as one of the primary leaders in the Durham movement. But many of the experiences mentioned previously in this chapter were at least partially afforded by his involvement in the NAACP.

---

[97] Adam Fairclough, *Better Day Coming: Blacks and Equality, 1890-2000* (New York: Penguin Putnam, Inc., 2001), 246, 247.
[98] Roy Wilkins, telegram to George Cobb, 11 February 1960, NAACP Papers, microfilm 22:00106.
[99] "North Carolina NAACP Establishes Coordinating Unit For Sit-Down Protests" Press Release, 18 February 1960, NAACP Papers, microfilm 22:00125.

Many members of the NAACP youth councils and college chapters were pushing for the organization to become more militant not only through direct appeals for such an approach but also through their own actions. In *NAACP Youth and the Black Fight for Freedom, 1936-1965*, Thomas L. Bynum asserts that many of the activists that ultimately joined SNCC had begun their activism in the youth councils. He points out that NAACP college chapters throughout North Carolina ultimately supported the sit-ins, including those at Shaw University, Saint Augustine's College, and North Carolina College.[100] Durham was one of the most active cities in terms of NAACP youth council activity, which included the youth chapters at NCC, Durham Business College, Bull City Barber College, and DeShazor Beauty College, in addition to the Durham Youth Crusaders of the NAACP Council.[101] R. Arline Young, the head of the biology department at Shaw University, had been a key figure in the Durham NAACP. In the late 1940s, Young helped establish a college chapter of the NAACP on the NCC campus. According to Christina Greene, Young was instrumental in establishing a statewide NAACP youth council as well.[102] Young's efforts in Durham while a professor at Shaw University in Raleigh provides an example of the connections between two of the "Protest Triangle" schools that would ultimately become the most important institutions in pushing for changes in segregated practices and employment opportunities in the two cities in the early 1960s.

---

[100] Thomas Bynum, *NAACP Youth and the Fight for Black Freedom, 1936-1965* (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 2013), xiv, 101.
[101] "Callis Brown," 16 May 1960, NAACP Papers, Microfilm 22:00163, University of North Carolina at Greensboro; original at Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
[102] Greene, *Our Separate Ways*, 21-25.

In addition to providing encouragement and organizational support, the NAACP also provided practical and financial support for the students who became involved in sit-ins and protest demonstrations. One example occurred when Glenford Mitchell required financial assistance to remain at Shaw University. Mitchell was an important figure in the student movement in Raleigh and was also the editor of the school newspaper, *The Shaw Journal*. He was also a Shaw delegate in the North Carolina Student Legislature in 1960. Dr. Marguerite Adams, who was the State Director of the Youth Program and also a professor at Shaw, had appealed to NAACP Field Secretary Charles A. McLean for financial help, and after some fund-raising, over three hundred dollars was given to Mitchell for educational expenses. Yet McLean's report about the funding given to Mitchell is also revealing in the way it ostensibly views the student leadership. The report states that had Mitchell not been able to remain in college, "it would have seriously affected, if not brought to an end, the local demonstrations."[103] Perhaps this claim was merely a way of making the donation to Mitchell appear more critical. But it also may give a window into an important NAACP official not fully recognizing the group-centered leadership that existed in the Shaw-St. Augustine student movement. Mitchell was undoubtedly an important individual on campus and in the movement. But so were Albert Hockaday, David Forbes, Cornell Adams, William Peace, Eleanor Nunn, and Albert Sampson, among many others.[104] The point here is that the student leadership in

[103] Charles A. McLean, "Report on Sit-in Lunch Counter Strikes in North Carolina," 23, NAACP Papers, microfilm 22:00092.
[104] David Forbes, interview by the author; Albert Sampson, interview by the author; Carrie Gaddy Brock, interview by the author; Louis Powell, interview by the author; McLouis Clayton, interview by the author; Otis Tucker, Jr., mail interview by the author.

Raleigh was diffuse and talented enough that it did not hinge on the fortunes of one individual.

At Shaw University, an important member of the College Chapter of the NAACP was Albert Sampson, who would ultimately become both the chapter president and the Student Council president for the 1960-1961 academic year.[105] Sampson had attended high school in Everett, Massachusetts, the same city in which Grady D. Davis pastored the Zion Baptist Church.[106] In 1956, Davis convinced Sampson to attend Shaw University, and he entered as a freshman in the following year. Sampson was a junior when the sit-in movement broke out in February 1960. He recognized that the students had an important role to play, and that they could augment the work of the local, state and national NAACP. He recalled that "my position was: Roy Wilkins you go into the courts; we're going into the streets."[107] And like many other Shaw students, Sampson did go into the streets, and inside to the lunch counters. In one instance, the twenty-one-year-old Sampson conducted a sit-in with nineteen-year-old James Fox, who was a 6'4" power forward who averaged double-digit rebounds as a freshman for the Shaw basketball team.[108] Sampson and Fox were arrested for trespassing after refusing to leave the McLellan's Store on Fayetteville Street in downtown Raleigh on March 22, 1960.[109]

---

[105] *The Bear*, 1961, 26.
[106] Albert Sampson, interview by the author; Earl Thomas Wooten, "An Analysis of the Community Organization Process Employed by the Urban League of Greater Boston, Incorporated, In the Initial Stages of a Community Survey" (1951), *ETD Collection for AUC Robert W. Woodruff Library, Atlanta University Center*, Paper 726, http://digitalcommons.auctr.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2302&context=dissertations
[107] Albert Sampson, interview by the author.
[108] "Reece, Fox Big 'Bounders," *Shaw Journal*, March-April 1960, 7, NAACP Papers, Microfilm 22:00160, University of North Carolina at Greensboro; original at Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
[109] "Two Negroes Are Arrested for Trespass," *The News and Observer*, 22 March 1960, 22.

Sampson was another of the leaders who demonstrated that leadership in the direct action campaigns in Raleigh literally went from campus to counter.

But student leadership in pushing for better social and economic opportunities for African Americans was not limited to involvement in sit-ins and picketing stores with segregated lunch counters. At the North Carolina Student Legislative Assembly in March 17-19, 1960, Shaw University was represented by seven delegates: James Ballard, Mae Helen Covington, David Forbes, Albert Hockaday, Glenfield Knight, Glenford Mitchell, and William H. Peace. The Shaw delegation, along with students from the Woman's College of Duke University, introduced a resolution calling for the abolishment of capital punishment in North Carolina. Senator William H. Peace introduced the bill that passed both houses with "dignity and masterly eloquence" and was ultimately given an award for best speaker in the senate of the student assembly. And the Shaw delegation was also awarded a plaque for the best senate bill at the meeting. The Shaw delegation also supported a bill introduced by North Carolina A&T that called for desegregation of eating facilities in public establishments, which also passed. The Assembly failed to act on a bill sponsored by Johnson C. Smith University that called for the end of state aid to school boards that practiced racial discrimination. A bill introduced by Saint Augustine's College to lower the voting age from twenty-one to eighteen also failed to pass.[110]

Nonetheless, the March 1960 North Carolina Student Legislative Assembly was a major success in revealing that among students there was a general support for the end of

[110] "Shaw Captures NCSLA Awards," *The Shaw Journal*, March-April 1960, 1, 2, NAACP Papers, Microfilm 22:00148, 22:00150; "Resolution on Protests is Debated," *The News and Observer*, 19 March 1960, 16.

discriminatory practices at eating establishments in the state. In this sense, the Assembly gave a formal political voice to the student-led protests in the state. It also demonstrated that student leaders throughout the state, especially at historically black campuses, were acting as a counter to the adult political leadership in the state that often defended segregation. Just as the sit-ins and picketing of segregated businesses were spreading throughout the state and the Student Legislative Assembly gave support to desegregation, a (albeit limited) civil rights bill was being debated in the U.S. Congress with opposition coming from North Carolina representatives. North Carolina Senators Sam Ervin, Jr. and B. Everett Jordan were among only eighteen senators who voted against the civil rights bill that passed in the Senate less than a month after the meeting of the North Carolina Student Legislative Assembly.[111] Just as the student protestors from Shaw University and Saint Augustine's College literally proceeded from campus to the lunch counters in Raleigh, they also acted as a counter to city and state political leaders such as Mayor W.G. Enloe, Governor Luther Hodges, and Senators Ervin and Jordan.

The success of the Shaw delegation at the March meeting of the Student Legislative Assembly was bolstered by further success at the December 1960 meeting. Albert Sampson was one of the delegates who nearly did not attend, as students from African American colleges nearly boycotted the legislative sessions due to the segregated housing situation. Ultimately, the Legislature's President, Stephen R. Brasswell of Duke University, urged the students to reject the boycott and encouraged them to attend and air their grievances. Due to segregated practices, white student legislators lodged at local

[111] Washington UPI, "Assures Negro of Vote: Civil Rights Measure Passes Senate, 71-18," *The News and Observer*, 9 April 1960, 1, 2.

hotels, while black student representatives stayed on the campuses of Shaw University and Saint Augustine's College. Just as Shaw was the epicenter of the civil rights movement in the South for three days in mid-April, so was Shaw University at the heart of the movement in North Carolina in early December. Aside from providing housing for the African American representatives, delegates from Shaw also introduced a resolution stipulating that "all housing assignments for delegates to this Assembly be made on a totally racially non-segregated basis." Ultimately, a compromise resolution was passed based on a proposal by Duke University's William Y. Manson that mostly promoted the new commitment to desegregated housing: "More specifically in the future, whenever humanly possible, that the housing for this body while it is in session shall be arranged on a racially non-segregated basis."[112]

Sampson and the Shaw delegation also supported a bill introduced by the delegation from Livingstone College, a historically black college in Salisbury, which sought to abolish all forms of racial segregation in North Carolina. Specifically, part of the bill called for "full and equal privileges in places of public accommodation, resort, entertainment and amusement, and equal rights in employment." The bill passed in the Student Legislative Assembly House of Representatives 66-12 and 22-18 in the Senate.[113] Students from historically black colleges had shown that the momentum of the sit-in movement had helped to reinforce a will to use political influence to help to bring about integration. They had received extensive, yet not unanimous, support from white

[112] "Legislators Compromise On Housing," *The News and Observer*, 9 December 1960, 40.
[113] "Race Issue Is Debated By Students," *The News and Observer,* 10 December 1960, 18.

college students in the state. Yet securing support from adult state political leaders in 1960 and the following years would prove a much more daunting task.

In a 2016 interview, Andrew J. Young likened the inner leadership of SCLC to that of a basketball team.[114] While Young was not involved in the April 1960 conference at Shaw University, a basketball metaphor appears equally applicable to the events of the conference, and the emergence of student leadership that both preceded and was enhanced by discussions and proposals during that Easter weekend. Different types of leaders contributed in unique ways, much as basketball players at different positions might contribute to a team's victory. After his involvement in the Montgomery bus boycott and the 1957 Prayer Pilgrimage, Martin Luther King Jr. became the most nationally recognized civil rights leader.[115] He was at the center of the media attention during the conference. Regardless of criticism from both conservatives and more radical elements in the movement in the following years, King was very much at the center of the increasingly national movement. In her role as primary organizer of the conference and as an advocate for allowing student leadership to blossom, Ella Baker was perhaps the most important guiding voice at the conference. Barbara Ransby argues that Baker was not the "hands-off facilitator that some have made her out to be." She maintains that the students needed guidance in some situations, and that Baker's intention was to provide a mentorship enabling the sit-in movement to "develop in a direction that she could influence but would not determine."[116] While Baker may not have been a "hands-

[114] Andrew Young, interview by the author.
[115] James L. Hicks, "King Emerges As Top Negro Leader," *New York Amsterdam News*, 1 June 1957, page number unknown, NAACP Papers, Microfilm 13:00008.
[116] Ransby, *Ella Baker and the Black Freedom Movement*, 243.

off" facilitator, she was a facilitator nonetheless, a sort of point guard if you will. Thus at the conference and in the civil rights movement more generally, a variety of individuals played key roles. Their various styles and approaches were effective in different ways, and each had their own specific contribution to the conference.

A good deal of the historiography of the Easter weekend conference at Shaw University in 1960 has dealt with the ostensible tensions between Ella Baker and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and also James Lawson's criticism of the NAACP. Those are indeed important aspects of the conference, and in some cases are symbolic of the larger movement. But what can often be lost in focusing on the more prominent adult leaders is the reality that the true significance of the Easter conference was the blooming of a student leadership that had already weathered many storms. Student participants from the Protest Triangle schools had already braved winter storms, obstinate politicians and business leaders, verbal assaults, exploding yolks, egg shells and ominous shotgun shells, and they brought these experiences with them to the conference. In many ways, they had already demonstrated that they could take leadership roles in the movement, and the events of April 15-17 reinforced that reality. Returning to the basketball analogy, one could argue that King was the center, while people like Baker played a sort of point guard role. The allegorical "basketball position" of any civil rights leader could be debated endlessly and is perhaps best left to the occupants of the bar stool, or even the lunch counter stool. But what should always be remembered both in historical scholarship and American memory is that in 1960 it was truly the student leaders that most forcefully helped the movement power forward.

CHAPTER V

EDUCATION VS. SEGREGATION: THE 1960 GUBERNATORIAL ELECTION AND THE REACTION TO THE SIT-INS

From his pulpit at Pullen Memorial Baptist Church in Raleigh on June 12, 1960, the Reverend William Wallace Finlator took a clear stance on the impending Democratic primary run-off election between Terry Sanford and Dr. I. Beverly Lake. The white preacher told his congregation that "whether consciously or unconsciously, it is to [a] vote of prejudice that Dr. Lake's campaign is pitched. It's just that simple. The issue is race and the appeal is prejudice."[1] Ten days later, State Board of Education Chairman Dallas Herring stated that North Carolina had "dedicated itself to the unalterable truth that education is the open door to freedom and prosperity. That door must not be closed in this critical hour—not for fear or prejudice or any other reason or excuse."[2] Whereas Finlator's words expressed a clear disapproval of I. Beverly Lake's appeal for maintaining segregation, Herring's statements also appear to be a shot at Lake's candidacy and his plans to block further school integration in North Carolina. Both Herring and Finlator were representative of two of the segments of the population that provided strong (albeit not always unified) resistance to Lake's approach to maintaining segregation in North Carolina: religious leaders and advocates of maintaining and improving public education.

---

[1] "Pastor Hits Lake Candidacy," *News and Observer*, 13 June 1960, 22.
[2] Chapel Hill AP, "Herring Says: Forces of Reaction Threaten Education," *News and Observer*, 23 June 1960, 34.

This chapter will address the response of white political and religious leaders and that of important social figures to the sit-ins and other civil rights protests in North Carolina. It will also analyze how the increased focus on civil rights and the corresponding reaction among North Carolinians shaped the gubernatorial election in 1960. I will demonstrate the ways in which student activists, especially those from historically black colleges, had an influence on the election, including Lake's decision to enter the race.[3] My primary argument is that in the 1960 Democratic primary election, a forward-looking view that emphasized improvements in public education trumped a reactionary view focused on halting integration in schools and in society. Ultimately, the sit-ins and civil rights activism played a role in shaping some of the central debates in the election, and in the ensuing months and years, the results of the election would play a role in the reaction to civil rights activism in the state.

In the dime stores and lunch counters in Raleigh and Durham, southern hospitality was indeed complicated hospitality. In response to the sit-ins in early February 1960 in North Carolina, state Attorney General Malcolm Seawell publicly reminded the people of the state that no North Carolina law existed requiring segregation at eating places. But he also declared that business owners could order customers to leave and request to have them arrested if they refused to comply.[4] But what really made the segregated lunch counters at chain stores like F.W. Woolworth, S.H. Kress, and Walgreen's complicated was that they accepted African American customers everywhere in the store except the

[3] Gene Roberts, Jr., "Court Order His Springboard: Lake Stirring Passions on Desegregation Issue," *News and Observer*, 19 May 1960, 1, 2.
[4] Graham Jones, "Seawell Says Proprietors Can Select Their Customers," *News and Observer*, 11 February 1960, 1.

lunch counters. An unsigned editorial in Raleigh's *News and Observer* provided an apt metaphor, stating that black patrons were "cordially invited to the house but definitely not the table. And to say the least this was complicated hospitality."[5] In some establishments, black customers were allowed to order at the lunch counter and take the food outside to eat. In the wake of the sit-ins, the downtown Raleigh S.H. Kress store took away the stools from an upstairs lunch counter, and blacks and whites were served standing up.[6] This awkward practice seemed to validate *Carolina Israelite* editor Harry Golden's tongue-in-cheek suggestion that he initially made in reference to school integration. In 1956 Golden had sardonically proposed a "Vertical Negro Plan" in which all of the seats at schools could be removed since "it is only when the Negro 'sets' that the furs begin to fly."[7] Golden's biographer Kimberly Marlowe Hartnett asserts that Golden undoubtedly knew about Durham merchant and the city's first Jewish mayor, E.J. "Mutt" Evans, who had removed the stools from his department store's snack bar and allowed whites and blacks to eat standing up.[8]

Golden's support of civil rights for African Americans went beyond his clever wit in his book *Only in America* and in his Charlotte-based newspaper, *Carolina Israelite*. Golden was a strong supporter of the student led sit-ins. He was a guest speaker at the aforementioned Student Legislative Assembly session in which Shaw University delegates won awards for the best bill and best speaker in the Senate. Golden encouraged

---

[5] "Complicated Custom" (editorial), *News and Observer*, 11 February 1960, 4.
[6] "At Local Store: Stand-Up Service Satisfies Pickets," *News and Observer*, 21 February 1960, 1, 2.
[7] Kimberly Marlowe Hartnett, *Carolina Israelite: How Harry Golden Made Us Care About Jews, the South, and Civil Rights* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2015), 166.
[8] Ibid.

the students to "watch and be alive" to the sit-in protests in the South.[9] Golden was also a featured speaker at North Carolina College's Golden Anniversary in November 1960, celebrating fifty years since the founding of the college. Golden, who was Jewish, emphasized how non-whites had been mistreated in the United States, especially in the South. Furthermore, Golden discussed the relation between accelerated social action and desegregation. He acknowledged that desegregation was not the answer to all racial problems but that it was first on the list. Perhaps most importantly, Golden argued that because education was so important in the United States, it was the best place to start in improving conditions for African Americans.[10] Thus, Golden was one among a small minority of whites in North Carolina who used his fame to advance the rights and opportunities of African Americans, and he would continue to do so in the following years. And like many of the students at historically black colleges, he also seemed to appreciate the connection between education and civil rights in a region that had often fallen short of most of the rest of the nation in both regards.

The type of clear, strong support and encouragement Golden gave to student civil rights activists, however, was rare among prominent whites in North Carolina in 1960. But religious leaders were one of the segments of the population that demonstrated leadership in promoting the goals of the sit-ins. Among the white pastors in Raleigh who supported the student activists, no one was more important than the Reverend W.W. Finlator. The Pullen Memorial Baptist Church minister took a principled stand in support

[9] "Shaw Captures NCSLA Awards," *Shaw Journal*, March-April 1960, 1, 2, NAACP Papers, microfilm 22:00147, 22:00150, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
[10] "Golden Featured in Symposium," *Campus Echo*, 28 November 1960, 5.

of the sit-ins from a very early stage when it was quite risky and uncommon for whites to do so. In the same week in which the Raleigh sit-ins began, Finlator praised the local students for protesting against segregation at the lunch counters. He issued a statement asserting that the students "are doing in our day what we honored our forefathers for doing in their day. And that is struggling for liberty."[11] Finlator also understood the reality that the sit-ins were part of a broader struggle for the rights of African Americans. In March 1960, Finlator was the opening speaker at the annual state convention of the AFL-CIO. The reverend called for "a ban henceforth and forever against discrimination" and also asked the more than 245 delegates: "Will you not understand that the fortunes of the Southern white laborer and the Southern Negro rise or fall together?"[12] Finlator was not the only white person in Raleigh who favored integration or supported the efforts of the student demonstrators and black community members to achieve integration. But his support was unabashed, and unlike some whites, he did not value preserving unfair social and economic practices merely because they were a tradition in Raleigh and North Carolina. In a year in which many white political leaders in the state either wholeheartedly supported segregation or at the least tempered their personal support for civil rights for the sake of political expediency, Finlator was a beacon of moral leadership.

Finlator's support for the civil rights activists was echoed by a large number of Raleigh ministers representing all of the Protestant denominations in the city. On March

---

[11] Raleigh AP, "Raleigh Hits Sitdown Moves With Arrest of 41 Negroes: Students Charged With Trespassing," *Durham Morning Herald*, 13 February 1960, 1.
[12] David Cooper, "Minister Urges Labor to Abolish Racial Discrimination in Unions," *News and Observer*, 17 March 1960, 30.

2, 1960, forty-six white ministers and thirteen black ministers signed a public statement that gave support to the civil rights demonstrators. They commended "students and other persons who use orderly and non-violent means in a forgiving spirit to express their views on the practices of discrimination."[13] Thus, the ministers were not merely recognizing that they favored integration, but also that they supported the direct-action tactics to achieve that end. Among the significant African American signers of the statement were John W. Fleming, who helped resuscitate the Raleigh Citizens Association, and not surprisingly, the Dean of the Shaw University School of Religion, Dr. Grady Davis. Among the notable white ministers were Finlator and Oscar B. Woolridge. Woolridge was the spokesperson for the group and was also the religious coordinator at North Carolina State College. The group also sent letters to the New York headquarters of F.W. Woolworth and S.H. Kress urging them to adopt non-discriminatory practices at their stores in which segregation still existed. They also sent a similar letter to Raleigh Mayor W.G. Enloe, who did not demonstrate the same type of commitment to civil rights that the group of fifty-nine ministers was showing.[14]

Support for integration from religious leaders in Raleigh and Durham was certainly not unanimous. Woolridge qualified his group's statement by making clear that the fifty-nine ministers were speaking as individuals and did not intend to speak for all of their members. More specifically, he emphasized that the action of producing the statement was done independently of the Raleigh Ministers' Association.[15] In Durham

[13] Gene Roberts, Jr., "Racial Troubles Prompt Statement By Preachers," *News and Observer*, 3 March 1960, 1, 3.
[14] Ibid.
[15] Ibid.

later that month, the Durham Ministers Association pledged their support for the goals and also the tactics of the demonstrators: "We recognize and honor the desire and the right of all citizens, whether Negro or white, to seek by all appropriate, just, peaceful, and legal means, equal public treatment as citizens."[16] The statement also promised support to any stores that would initiate a policy of integration. Thus, in Durham, the actual Ministers Association demonstrated unified support for integration. However, not every minister in the city supported desegregation. The Conservative Ministers Association held a meeting the following day and issued a statement that made it clear that "we feel the public should be informed that the recently expressed views of the Durham Ministers Association as reported in the March 15 Herald ARE NOT the views of the Conservative Ministers Association."[17] Hence the opposition to segregation among religious leaders was not monolithic. Yet the extensive support for integration given by white ministers demonstrated that white support for segregation in North Carolina was not monolithic either. Sympathetic ministers used their social position to take a principled stand that few political leaders cared or dared to take.

An analysis of North Carolina's most famous preacher, Billy Graham, sheds light upon many of the central conflicts in the South regarding segregation. Graham had personally supported integration and held integrated revivals.[18] He admired Martin Luther King, Jr. and developed a personal relationship with him. The evangelist and

---

[16] "Ministers Take Stand On Food Service: Individual Rights Are Supported," *Durham Morning Herald*, 15 March 1960, 1B.
[17] "Ministers Group Issues Statement," *Durham Morning Herald*, 16 March 1960, 1B. Emphasis in the original.
[18] Steven Patrick Miller, *Billy Graham and the Rise of the Republican South* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 28.

Charlotte native also provided moral support to Dorothy Counts, who attempted to integrate Harding High School in Charlotte in 1957. After reading about her courageous efforts, Graham wrote a letter to the fifteen-year- old: "Democracy demands that *you* hold fast and carry on …. Those cowardly whites against you will never prosper because they are un-American and unfit to lead."[19] After an early 1960 trip to South Africa, Graham declared that segregation was doomed in that nation. He argued that "in no period of history had apartheid worked," and he also described race relations in the United States as an embarrassment to Americans in Africa.[20] In this sense, Graham seemed to demonstrate his aversion to segregation. His statements also can be viewed in light of the Cold War-era concern for winning the hearts and minds of South Africans and the people of other nations in Africa, which was undoubtedly negatively affected by the reality of segregation in the American South. Yet when Graham was asked about segregation in the American South, he said he would prefer to wait to get back home to discuss that and said, "I don't think Southerners appreciate people sitting in New York and pointing the finger at them."[21] In essence, Graham tried to walk a fine line between supporting integration and not alienating his white supporters in the South. But his stance was also emblematic of the tendency of many white Southerners to view civil rights agitation as emanating from New York or the North more broadly. References to "outside agitators" were a common strategy among Southern politicians to attempt to portray civil rights demonstrations as being inspired by outsiders when in fact the majority of student

[19] Frye Gaillard, *The Dream Long Deferred* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 10.
[20] New York AP, "'Segregation Doomed,' Billy Graham Declares," *News and Observer*, 30 March 1960, 3.
[21] Ibid.

activists were southerners, even if they were not always members of the local communities in which they demonstrated.

It is important to reiterate that general support for gradual integration was not the same as supporting the direct-action tactics such as sit-ins. Graham essentially favored the former and was wary of the latter. Like many other southerners who were open to integration, he did not support direct-action tactics like sit-ins in 1960. Historian Clive Webb points out that Graham had raised the ire of many southern whites by suggesting that there was no biblical basis for segregation. But Webb also maintains that the sit-ins ran counter to Graham's gradualist approach to improving race relations. In November 1960, Graham told a reporter: "No matter what the law may be—it may be an unjust law—I believe we have a Christian responsibility to obey it."[22] Graham's stance ultimately decried segregation but also did not support the tactics that sought to hasten its demise. In the final analysis, he was wary of civil disobedience even when it carried a moral imperative.

The Episcopal Church provided leadership on a national level in supporting the sit-ins. In late March 1960, the Church's National Council issued a statement to its approximately three million members that declared: "The Church in its basic teachings insists upon the dignity of all men before God. It is therefore not surprising that Christians are in the forefront of the demonstrations and that this 'passive resistance' movement has definite relationship to the churches both in teaching and leadership." The

[22] Clive Webb, "Breaching the Wall of Resistance: White Southern Reactions to the Sit-Ins," in *From Sit-Ins to SNCC: The Student Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s*, ed. Iwan Morgan and Philip Davies (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2012), 66-67.

statement also made the point that Christianity has taught that civil disobedience is justified in certain cases involving moral issues.[23] At the forefront of support among Episcopalians was the Episcopal Society for Cultural and Racial Unity (ESCRU), which had been founded on the campus of Saint Augustine's College in 1959. Members of ESCRU challenged Episcopalian leaders in the South who opposed integration. Thomas Pettigrew, who was a member of the ESCRU board of directors, claimed that every so-called moderate in the segregated South was really "a paternalistic segregationist of nineteenth century vintage," and was clinging to archaic ideas in regards to race relations.[24]

The leadership of ESCRU was steadfast in their support for integration and the sit-ins, but they also recognized the need to not alienate the more conservative elements in the church organization. For example, Carl and Anne Braden were excited when they heard about the founding of ESCRU and asked one of the organization's founders, John B. Morris, about starting a chapter in Louisville. But Morris was wary of associating the nascent group with the Bradens since Carl had been imprisoned for his refusal to answer questions before the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC). Gardiner Shattuck argues that Morris's cold war mentality in this instance revealed the essentially centrist political leanings of the ESCRU leadership.[25]

Yet even if the organization was centrist in its political leanings, it by no means took a "moderate" stance on race relations, at least by southern standards. Supporting the

---

[23] George W. Cornell (New York AP), "Episcopal Church Backs Sitdown Movement," *News and Observer*, 31 March 1960, 13.
[24] Gardiner H. Shattuck, *Episcopalians and Race: Civil War to Civil Rights* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2000), 104.
[25] Shattuck, *Episcopalians and Race*, 105.

sit-ins as a tactic was much more aggressive than simply stating that the group favored integration. The ESCRU leadership ultimately supported efforts by activists to integrate churches in the South through the use of "kneel-ins." In perhaps its most progressive stance, a resolution was adopted at the ESCRU annual meeting in 1961 that recognized "neither theological nor biological barriers to marriage between persons of different color."[26] As Shattuck points out, this position caused some moderately liberal bishops and church leaders in the South to cancel their membership in ESCRU, as the clear stance on interracial marriage may have alienated their support in their local churches.[27] Ultimately, taking a strong stand on integration was a risky move for some church leaders, but one that many believed was consistent with the teachings of the church and Christianity more broadly. ESCRU was an example of a church organization that took a forward-looking stance that rejected archaic social traditions. In their support of the sit-ins and ultimately the kneel-ins, the organization gave moral and spiritual support to integration leaders, including student leaders who attended the school that was the site of the founding of the organization, Saint Augustine's College.

In addition to receiving support from certain church leaders and church organizations both within and beyond the Triangle, student protestors in Raleigh and Durham received official support from some religious groups at the primarily (or exclusively) white schools in the region. On March 2, 1960, Baptist student leaders at North Carolina State College in Raleigh called for a boycott of stores that practiced segregation. The resolution was announced by the Baptist Student Union Executive

[26] Shattuck, *Episcopalians and Race*, 106.
[27] Ibid.

Council, which represented over four hundred of the approximately six thousand students at the college. The resolution indirectly endorsed the sit-in tactics, giving support to "the moral goal of the Negroes for social equality under the law of our land and to uphold the right of Negro students and leaders to use the instrument of active but non-violent public demonstration to advance their cause."[28] Similar support came from Duke University Divinity School students in a resolution in which they endorsed the non-violent student movement and even acknowledged their own guilt for their own past participation in the "broken community among men." The statement even targeted segregated practices directly: "We believe that the policy of segregated lunch counters, followed by certain local merchants and chain stores is not in harmony with Christian principles."[29] The resolution also expressed the students' willingness to eat at integrated lunch counters.[30] The resolutions from Duke University and North Carolina State College were important in revealing that support for the sit-ins was more widespread than just the few students from these two colleges who actually participated in the sit-ins. It also provides another example that sympathy for the cause of civil rights was generally strong (although far from universal) among religious leaders and students—even white students— in the region.

An editorial in *The News and Observer* on March 15, 1960, lucidly revealed the intersections between race relations and education that became more apparent as a result of the student-led civil rights demonstrations in 1960. Vance Barron, a white pastor at

---

[28] Raleigh UPI, "Baptist Students Ask Boycott in Raleigh," *Durham Morning Herald*, 13 March 1960, 10.
[29] "Sitdown Move Commended By Duke Divinity Students," *Durham Morning Herald*, 16 April 1960, 1B.
[30] Ibid.

The Presbyterian Church in Chapel Hill, criticized Woman's College Chancellor Gordon Blackwell's speech that essentially discouraged students from the college in Greensboro from participating in the sit-ins, and he also condemned Governor Luther Hodges's approval of the speech. Barron made the point that the duties and responsibilities of the student cannot be confined to the limits of the campus. He suggested that for a chancellor of a college to limit the activities of students outside the college would be a limit to their freedom to act and think as responsible individuals. He further asserted that efforts from the college administration or the state government to limit students from acting on their personal convictions would be an example of "thought control by the State…and the end of true education: for true education depends upon freedom, just as freedom depends upon education."[31] Hence Barron made the connection between academic freedom and civil rights protests that so many black and white college students in the Triangle made in 1960. And like the student protestors, Barron recognized the interrelation between freedom and education that would become quite apparent in the 1960 gubernatorial Democratic primary run-off election between Fayetteville lawyer and racial moderate Terry Sanford, and Raleigh lawyer and staunch segregationist I. Beverly Lake.

Sanford and Lake ultimately squared off in a Democratic Party primary run-off election that had tremendous implications for the future of segregation in the state. My analysis of the 1960 gubernatorial election focuses on the Democratic Party primary because for all intents and purposes, in the nine decades after Reconstruction, winning

[31] Vance Barron, "Chancellor Blackwell's Speech" (editorial), *News and Observer*, 15 March 1960, 5.

the Democratic primary for governor was tantamount to winning the general election. By 1960, only one Republican had won the governor's office since 1877. For much of that period, African Americans had been largely disenfranchised in the state through various tactics, including poll taxes and literacy tests. North Carolina had eliminated the use of the poll tax by 1920, and by 1944, only certain counties utilized the all-white primary. Michael J. Klarman maintains that North Carolina never conducted statewide all-white primaries.[32] Thus, the 1944 Supreme Court decision in *Smith v. Allwright* that deemed the all-white primary unconstitutional had a lesser impact in North Carolina than in other states in the South. Nonetheless, in a state in which Republicans were often not competitive in major elections, the Democratic primary was the crucial election. The 1960 Democratic primary election for governor of North Carolina was initially a four-man race among former North Carolina Democratic Party Chairman John D. Larkins, Jr., Attorney General Malcolm Seawell, Terry Sanford, and I. Beverly Lake. My analysis will focus primarily on the run-off election between Sanford and Lake. Focusing on these two candidates will make sharper the contrast between two competing ideologies that the two candidates represented, one that emphasized improvements in education and the other which emphasized doubling down on preserving segregation in the state.

Students at historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) played a significant role in influencing the 1960 North Carolina gubernatorial election. The sit-in movement in various locations throughout the state pushed the issue of race relations to the forefront of the election, and the ways in which the candidates navigated the

[32] Michael J. Klarman, "The White Primary Rulings: A Case Study in the Consequences of Supreme Court Decision-making," *Florida State University Law Review*, 29 (2014): 65, http://ir.law.fsu.edu/lr/vol29/iss1/2

contentious issue played a significant role in determining the eventual winner of the Democratic Party primary elections. In many ways, black (and some white) college students galvanized support for civil rights through an expanded concept of academic freedom that connected civil rights protest activity with opening societal opportunities. Many sit-in participants viewed their actions as part of their education, as dismantling segregation would potentially open more societal and economic opportunities.[33] Thus, for black college students, education and civil rights protests were mutually reinforcing. Although the sit-ins were primarily targeting segregated public accommodations, they were part of a broader assault on segregation that included segregated schools. Before the sit-in movement began in North Carolina, the race issue had not registered as a serious concern among potential voters, according to a poll that Sanford had commissioned Lou Harris to conduct prior to the outbreak of sit-ins in the state.[34] This result does not imply that race relations were not an issue at all but suggests it was not a top priority to address in the upcoming election. But the sit-in movement heightened the concern over race relations in the state and helped to set the stage for the Democratic primary election in which concerns over segregation, including school segregation, would play a crucial role.

The most direct, yet unintended, consequence of the sit-ins in shaping the 1960 Democratic primary gubernatorial election was their influence in pushing Lake to decide to run for governor. Lake had considered a run for the state's highest position, but by

[33] See survey results in appendix.
[34] Howard E. Covington, Jr. and Marion A. Ellis, *Terry Sanford: Politics, Progress, and Outrageous Ambitions* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1999), 205

mid-February 1960, he had withdrawn himself from the race due to a lack of potential campaign funds. But as the sit-ins continued to spread throughout the state, letters and financial contributions came in from supporters asking him to re-enter the race.[35] On March 1, the same day that Lake appeared on NBC's "Today Show," with a panel that included North Carolina College (NCC) student protest leader Lacy Streeter, Lake announced in a separate press conference that he was entering the governor's race. In his announcement, he stated that he would support "the right of the owner of any store, restaurant or café to decide for himself what customers he will serve and what prices he will charge."[36] Lake characterized the segregation issue as the "most far-reaching problem North Carolina has faced in this century," and vowed to preserve the social order that maintained segregation.[37] Lake himself made it clear from an early point in his candidacy that he would be the strongest supporter of segregation among the four candidates vying to be the Democratic nominee.

Lake's entrance into the gubernatorial race came approximately a month after Terry Sanford officially announced his candidacy. Sanford had graduated from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 1939 and was a veteran of World War II. He served one term as a state senator from 1953-1955. From 1948-1960, he practiced law in Fayetteville, where his office overlooked the historic Market House in the heart of downtown, a structure both historically revered and reviled due to it having been a primary site of the slave market in the city prior to the Civil War. It was from this

[35] Gene Roberts, Jr., "Court Order His Springboard: Lake Stirring Passions On Desegregation Issue," *News and Observer*, 19 May 1960, 2.
[36] Charles Clay, "Lake To Run: Sounds Segregationist Theme," *News and Observer*, 2 March 1960, 1.
[37] Ibid.

historic site that Sanford announced his candidacy for governor on February 4, 1960, a day known in Fayetteville as "Terry Sanford Day."[38] From an early point in his campaign, Sanford made clear his commitment to improving education in North Carolina. At a speech to the Young Democratic Club in Chapel Hill on March 16, he called education the "dominant issue in this campaign and…the dominant purpose of our administration."[39] Later in the campaign Sanford declared that "I am for, above all, lifting our school system from the bottom 10 to the top 10."[40] Like the other three candidates, Sanford also addressed other issues in the campaign such as improvements in roads, industrial expansion, and agricultural policies. But it was clear throughout the campaign that his emphasis was on improving public education, and ultimately, his actions as governor would validate that this emphasis was not merely campaign posturing.

It would be inaccurate to suggest that I. Beverly Lake did not emphasize education in the 1960 election. However, the way in which he emphasized education was nearly always in relation to preserving segregated schools at all costs. Lake was adamantly opposed to even the token integration taking place in the state. His acknowledgment that the spread of the sit-in movement caused him to re-enter the race seems to indicate that he recognized that the student-led movement could potentially lead to more aggressive efforts at integrating the public elementary and secondary schools in the state. In mid-March, Lake declared that he would not support the 1954 Supreme

---

[38] Covington and Ellis, *Terry Sanford*, 92-93, 201-202.
[39] "School Issue: Terry Sanford Takes 'Moderate Approach,'" *News and Observer*, 17 March 1960, 1.
[40] Charles Craven, "Sanford Lead Tops 82,000," *News and Observer*, 31 May 1960, 1.

Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* and that he would use every gubernatorial power "to the fullest extent practicable" to prevent integration of the schools.[41] Although the other three candidates were clearly not integrationists themselves, they favored a so-called "moderate" approach, which allowed for minimal integration or at the minimum allowing integration to occur at schools in which local school boards chose to accept African Americans. But Lake drew the line in the sand between himself and the other three candidates, explicitly acknowledging that he was different. On April 19, he asserted that the primary difference between himself and the other candidates was in the "attitude and awareness" of the integration issue. He claimed that "integration of the schools would be a tragic development for both whites and Negroes," and that "if elected I will do all I can to avoid that situation. I would also take my election to mean that's what the people want."[42] Thus, Lake recognized that his election prospects were closely tied to his strategy of emphasizing resistance to integration.

At the heart of Lake's candidacy and his plan if he were elected was to create a "climate of public opinion" against integration of the schools. And one of his most consistent tactics was not to criticize African Americans in general, but to attack the NAACP. Even during Lake's time as the Assistant Attorney General of North Carolina in the mid-1950s, he had declared that "the NAACP is our enemy, not the Negro people."[43] Opposition to the NAACP among white politicians in the South was hardly novel in 1960, but he made the attacks on the NAACP a central part of his campaign.

---

[41] Gene Roberts, Jr., "Lake Attacks State's Approach to School Integration Problem," *News and Observer*, 18 March 1960, 1.
[42] Wilmington UPI, "On Integration: Lake Says He's Different," *News and Observer*, 20 April 1960, 5.
[43] Asheboro, N.C. AP, "Assistant Attorney General Sees Need-Private Schools Asked To Avoid Integration," *Durham Sun*, 15 July 1955, 1.

Lake also attacked the Hodges administration for "appeasing" the NAACP with token integration. He blamed the administration for making North Carolina the "soft spot in the South" in regards to integration.[44] Attacking Hodges on his positions on race relations demonstrates Lake's reactionary views about race relations. Hodges portrayed himself as a moderate on race relations. But he had made his opposition to the *Brown* decision abundantly clear early in his first term as governor when he assumed the position after the death of William Umstead in November 1954.[45] He also supported the Southern Manifesto, a declaration signed by 101 Southern Congressman expressing formal protest against what they deemed as the U.S. Supreme Court's usurpation of power. As mentioned in chapter two, Hodges opposed the tactics of the sit-in demonstrators. He also ostensibly played the subliminally racist game of blurring his pronunciation of the widely accepted word Negro and the much more offensive and phonetically similar word, resulting in "Nigra."[46] According to Saint Augustine's College student LaMonte Wyche, Hodges spoke at the campus, and in a somewhat playful protest, the students dropped their books each time he said "Nigra."[47] Hodges was far from an integrationist or a liberal when it came to race relations, but Lake's campaign was making it clear that he would be a more reactionary governor than Hodges in terms of race relations.

---

[44] Raeford AP, "Lake Raps Governor's Programs," *News and Observer*, 1 April 1960, 7; Greenville AP, "Campaign Trail: Lake Says NC 'Soft Spot,'" *News and Observer*, 6 May 1960, 6.
[45] Luther H. Hodges, "The Segregation Problem in the Public Schools of North Carolina," Box 131, untitled folder, Special File: Governor's Committee for Public School Amendment, Governor's Papers, Luther Hodges, North Carolina State Archives, Raleigh.
[46] LaMonte Wyche, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 29 June 2016; Walter Riley, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 14 June 2016.
[47] LaMonte Wyche, interview by the author.

It was in this context that the four-man race for the Democratic nomination for governor of North Carolina would take place at the end of May 1960. A last minute full-page ad in *The News and Observer* sponsored by the Wake County "Lake for Governor Committee" revealed the focus of Lake's campaign, as it headlined: "A BALANCED BUDGET…SCHOOL SEGREGATION…STATE'S RIGHTS…and PROPERTY RIGHTS." The ad also emphasized that "the mixing of our two great races in the classroom and then in the home is not inevitable and is not to be tolerated," in addition to bluntly stating that "THE NAACP IS OUR ENEMY."[48] Aside from the reference to school integration opposition, the ad's eight bullet points do not make clear reference to improving education, a striking omission in any governor's race. Of course, Lake did not avoid discussing education in his campaign, but it was clear where his focus lay: maintaining segregation.

On May 28, 1960, the voters of North Carolina turned out in record numbers with over 653,000 casting votes in the four-way Democratic primary. Sanford won a clear plurality with about 41 percent of the vote, while Lake got 28 percent, and Seawell and Larkins roughly split the remaining difference.[49] State law stipulated that if one candidate did not secure a majority then the second place finisher was entitled to call for a run-off. According to Sanford biographers Howard E. Covington, Jr. and Marion Ellis, Lake was encouraged by the results, claiming that the "thrill of victory was strong at Lake's headquarters."[50] It was indeed impressive that Lake had garnered such support

[48] (Political Advertisement), "If You Really Know Dr. Beverly Lake: You'll Vote For Him ON May 28," *News and Observer*, 26 May 1960, 31.
[49] Covington and Ellis, *Terry Sanford*, 223.
[50] Ibid.

with somewhat limited resources and had defeated the ultimate Democratic Party insider and former state chairman of the party, John Larkins, Jr., as well as state Attorney General and Hodges favorite, Malcolm Seawell. Larkins and Seawell were much more closely aligned with Sanford in terms of their position as "moderates" on segregation. Thus, the run-off election would ultimately make much clearer the choice between two approaches to race relations and segregation.

In 1960, Terry Sanford was not a clear supporter of integration. The simple reality is that taking a strong stand in support of integration in North Carolina during the election of 1960 would likely have been political suicide. The previously mentioned survey that Lou Harris conducted showed that whites favored segregation overall by a margin of two to one. Additionally, over half of those polled believed that blacks had no right to be served where they were not wanted.[51] Even though Sanford did not promote integration, he represented a clear alternative to the staunchly segregationist Lake. Sanford advocated continuing community-based decision-making, and thus, very gradual integration of the schools, a strategy which Sanford and others believed would prevent the Supreme Court or the federal government from intervening and forcing integration. By the end of the 1959-1960 school year, a mere thirty-four black children were in the previously all-white schools.[52] But Lake sought to promote a "climate of public opinion" against school integration, and his approach to race relations ran contrary to the moderate approach to race relations, which could be a winning strategy when promoted by a

[51] Covington and Ellis, *Terry Sanford*, 215.
[52] Covington and Ellis, *Terry Sanford*, 222

candidate like Sanford who was popular in other aspects, especially in regards to his approach to education (aside from the integration issue).

Perhaps Sanford's approach to racial issues and the election of 1960 can be most simply demonstrated when he said, "Let's don't highlight it."[53] In addition to a commitment to improving state roads, Sanford continued to focus on stressing improvements in public education during the four weeks between the initial primary and the run-off and stressed that Lake's approach to resisting the *Brown* decision would lead to the closing of public schools in order to resist integration. And thus we return to the statements made by the Chairman of the State Board of Education, Dallas Herring, on June 22 that opened this chapter in which he ostensibly took a shot at Lake's appeal to fear and prejudice. Herring said that "reaction was never characteristic of the people of North Carolina," and that education "will always be the basic ingredient of our progress."[54] To a great extent, the run-off election tested whether the forces of reaction (in terms of race relations) would characterize the position of North Carolinians. Any election has several variables, including the amount of funding the candidate can secure, popularity in certain geographical areas due to the candidate living there, personal charm and charisma, and a variety of issues that might lead certain voters to vote for the candidate. But ultimately, the choice came down to a reactionary approach to race relations coupled with a "hold the line" view on educational funding on one hand, and on the other hand, a moderate view on race relations that left hope for future gains, coupled with a forward-looking vision that emphasized the importance of public education.

---

[53] Charles Craven, "Sanford Lead Tops 82,000," *News and Observer*, 31 May 1960, 1.
[54] "Herring Says: Forces of Reaction Threaten Education," *News and Observer*, 23 June 1960, 34.

On June 25, 1960, Sanford defeated Lake with a total of 352,133 to 275,288 votes.[55] In a state in which Democrats had a stranglehold on gubernatorial elections, this result all but assured Sanford to be the next governor, a reality made clear in *The News and Observer*'s slightly presumptuous but not exactly controversial statement on June 26 that Sanford "will succeed Luther Hodges as Governor of North Carolina."[56] The African American vote was heavily in favor of Sanford. In the initial primary, Sanford had fared very well among black voters. In three mostly black precincts in Raleigh, Sanford had won 95 percent of the vote, with a similar pattern in Winston-Salem and Greensboro. An interesting anomaly occurred in Durham in the initial primary, in which Seawell had won 89 percent of the vote in the five mostly black precincts to Sanford's 7 percent. Years later, Sanford admitted that he purposely conceded the black vote in Durham and even took steps for Seawell to win in the black neighborhoods so as not to appear to racial conservatives as having gotten the "bloc vote" among blacks.[57] Sanford's willingness to essentially concede black votes in the initial primary revealed that he believed it likely that the race would proceed to a run-off, and that he would be one of the two to move on. It may also indicate that Sanford had predicted that Lake would be his opponent in the run-off, and that securing the votes in Durham's primarily black precincts would not be a problem against Lake.

Not surprisingly, the African American vote for Sanford was nearly unanimous among those who chose to vote in the run-off election. In Durham County, Lake

---

[55] "Sanford Win Margin Is 76,288 Votes," *News and Observer*, 2 July 1960, 20.
[56] "Sanford Nominated For Governor," *News and Observer*, 26 June 1960, 1.
[57] John Drescher, *Triumph of Good Will: How Terry Sanford Beat a Champion of Segregation and Reshaped the South* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2000), 162.

narrowly defeated Sanford. But in the black precinct of Hillside High School, Sanford defeated Lake 812 to 2.[58] Sanford beat Lake in Wake County, with the bulk of his support coming in the city of Raleigh in which he held a nearly two to one advantage. Sanford dominated in the primarily black districts, such as the twentieth district, in which he won by a total of 1,055-12.[59] For the election as a whole, it is quite possible that black voters provided the difference in determining the victor. Sanford won by approximately 76,000 votes. Durham's black newspaper, *The Carolina Times* credited the African American vote with providing the winning votes for Sanford. The newspaper estimated that 70,000 to 90,000 blacks had voted. If about 90 percent of African Americans who voted chose Sanford, then it is possible that black votes did sway the election in Sanford's favor. The newspaper also stated that "it is also encouraging to know that a majority of white voters in North Carolina are no longer duped by a candidate for public office whose major platform plank is the race issue."[60] If indeed blacks had delivered the difference in the election, then Lake had received a very slight majority of white voters. In his analysis of the race, John Drescher argues that "Lake's pride in winning a majority of white voters assumes that the votes of black citizens somehow are worth less than the votes of white citizens. To him, they were."[61]

Among the black voters who had helped deliver Sanford's victory were students from historically black colleges. Pete Cunningham, who graduated from Saint Augustine's College only a month before the run-off primary, recalled that the 1960

---

[58] "Tabulation of Durham Voting," *Durham Morning Herald*, 26 June 1960, 6.
[59] "Total Vote in County is 28,519," *News and Observer*, 26 June 1960, 3.
[60] Drescher, *Triumph of Good Will*, 218; "Negro Vote Sanford's Win Margin: Estimated 75 Thousand Held Power Balance," *Carolina Times*, 2 July 1960, 1.
[61] Drescher, *Triumph of Good Will*, 218.

election was the first time that he had voted. He supported Sanford and believed that Lake "was a redneck from his heart."[62] 1960 Shaw University graduate Carrie Gaddy Brock remembers that she "was pro-Sanford all the way." When asked about her thoughts on Lake, she believed that "he would have the place [North Carolina] go from bad to worse."[63] The number of students at the "Protest Triangle" schools that voted for Sanford remains unclear. Based on student interviews I have conducted, it seems that far less than a majority voted in the election. First, some of the students were residents of other states. Second, many of the students were not old enough to vote in an era when the voting age was twenty-one. But for those that did follow the race, they were ostensibly unanimous in their dislike for I. Beverly Lake. Joseph Holt, Jr.'s family had gone through death threats and bomb threats during their attempt to desegregate Josephus Daniels Junior High and Needham Broughton High School in Raleigh, and the family was already keenly aware of who I. Beverly Lake was prior to 1960, largely due to his adamant opposition to school integration. Holt, Jr., who became a freshman at St. Augustine's College in the fall of 1960, believed that Lake was a "demagogue that spewed the venom of racial hatred."[64]

The relatively low numbers of students at historically black colleges who voted in the 1960 gubernatorial election do not tell the entire story of their impact on the election. First and foremost, the students had helped mobilize the black community to take a stronger stand for civil rights. Many African Americans in their respective communities

[62] Pete Cunningham, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 21 June 2016.
[63] Carrie Gaddy Brock, interview by the author, digital recording, 2 March 2016, Raleigh.
[64] Joseph Holt, Jr., interview by the author, digital recording, 7 July 2016, Raleigh.

appreciated the principled stand that the students took in pushing for integration and responded by becoming more involved in efforts to dismantle segregation and improve the quality of life for people of their race. One of the most obvious ways to express their opposition to segregation was to vote against Lake. The student-led sit-in movement also served to mobilize African American organizations. In Raleigh, the advent of the sit-in movement in that city led to the resuscitation of the Raleigh Citizens Association (RCA).[65] One of the primary functions of the RCA was the promotion of political candidates, and in the 1960 Democratic primary run-off, Sanford was the obvious choice over Lake. The peaceful protest movement also inspired new allies in the fight for racial justice. Whereas many religious leaders had supported better conditions for African Americans prior to 1960, the advent of the sit-in movement also helped raise the consciousness of both white and black religious leaders to take a clearer moral stand against segregation. The aforementioned statement from the pulpit by W.W. Finlator is but one example of a well-respected religious figure taking a moral stand against segregation, and its most outspoken proponent in North Carolina, I. Beverly Lake.[66]

Sanford's victory portended changes in segregated practices and in opportunities for African Americans in the following years. But some major changes took place before Sanford was even inaugurated as governor in January 1961. One of the most significant changes in Raleigh came when William Campbell became the first African American accepted into a previously all-white public school in the city. Just as with the Holt family

[65] "Citizens' Committee Reactivated In City," *Carolinian*, 20 February 1960, 1; "Citizens Association Plans Session To Organize Here," *Carolinian*, 18 June 1960, 1.
[66] "Pastor Hits Lake Candidacy," *News and Observer*, 13 June 1960, 22.

four years prior, it took tremendous courage for the Campbell family to push for their children to attend previously all-white schools. Ralph Campbell, Sr. had served in World War II and the Korean War before becoming an employee of the United States Postal Service; he also served as the president of the Raleigh chapter of the NAACP in the early 1960s.[67] As a federal employee, he was less concerned about losing his job in retaliation for his attempts to get his children into formerly all-white schools than if he had been employed by a white-owned business. Ralph Campbell, Sr. and his wife June made the courageous decision to seek entrance for Ralph, Jr. and Mildred to Morson Junior High School and for William Campbell to enter Murphey Elementary School for the 1960-1961 school year. Small-scale school integration had already taken place in several cities in North Carolina prior to the Campbell's request, including Durham the previous year. The city board of education in Durham had approved seven of two hundred five applications for African American students to attend formerly all-white schools for 1960-1961, an indicator of the slow approach in many school districts throughout North Carolina at the time. In Durham, five students had been accepted the previous year, bringing the total to twelve before Raleigh had accepted the first black student into a previously all-white school.[68] The other community in the Triangle, Chapel Hill, accepted its first three black students at the previously all-white Estes Hills Elementary School for the 1960-1961 school year.[69]

---

[67] Ron Cornwall, "Throng At Campbell Rites: Gov.'s Tribute Is One Of Hundreds," *Carolinian*, 19 May 1983, 1, 2.
[68] Durham AP, "Seven More Negroes Transferred at Durham," *News and Observer*, 26 August 1960, 8.
[69] Chapel Hill AP, "At Chapel Hill," *News and Observer*, 7 September 1960, 2.

In early September 1960, the city school board of Raleigh voted unanimously to accept William Campbell into Murphey Elementary School. However, Mildred and Ralph, Jr. were denied acceptance to Morson Junior High on the grounds that the school was already overcrowded. Ralph Campbell, Sr. told the school board, "I feel discriminated against as a citizen and as a taxpayer . . . . To assign a child at any time to a segregated school is in violation of the Constitution and the Supreme Court Decision of 1954."[70] Despite Campbell, Sr.'s expression of frustration, Mildred Campbell (Mildred Christmas) recalls that her parents were focused on William, who had been accepted, and viewed it as a baby step in the right direction. For Mildred, she shared in the ramifications of being part of the family that first integrated the Raleigh city schools. She recalls the consistent threatening phone calls and even bomb threats made toward her family. The Campbell children briefly stayed with relatives when the threats appeared realistic.[71] In this sense, they faced some of the same experiences as the Holt family over the previous four years.

June Campbell played a critical role in the effort at integrating Murphey Elementary and also in the broader struggle for improved conditions for African Americans in Raleigh. Her strength in taking William to school amidst verbal threats was part of the reason that her son later claimed that "she was an absolute warrior," and that "leadership knows no gender bounds."[72] She also played an important informal role in the struggle for African American freedom in Raleigh. She was a tremendous cook,

---

[70] Jane Hall, "Reassignment Asked For Two Pupils," *News and Observer*, 28 September 1960, 1, 2.
[71] Mildred (Campbell) Christmas, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 10 September 2016.
[72] William Campbell, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 12 September 2016.

and she provided meals for civil rights leaders that met at the Campbell's home. In the wake of the enhanced consciousness among African Americans that largely stemmed from the student-led sit-ins, and the Campbell family's challenge to segregated schools, 1960 was a crucial year in establishing the Campbell household as a hive of civil rights activity. That year provided the roots of what would become known as the Oval Table Gang, an informal and changing group of activists who discussed civil rights issues at an oval table in the house in the 1960s. Among June Campbell's delicious signature dishes were shrimp gumbo and macaroni and cheese. Yet she was not only providing comfort food in the traditional sense. The activists that sat at the legendary oval table found comfort in the camaraderie and friendship that eased the tension of an activism that could be exhausting and even downright dangerous in a segregated society.[73]

William Campbell's experiences on the way to school and in the school revealed many of the contradictions and hostilities of the segregated society in Raleigh. It exposed the ugliest face of a culture deeply rooted in unfair and even inhumane treatment of African Americans. But it also revealed some of the consistencies and connections among the various advocates of integration and improved opportunities for African Americans in the city and beyond. Some of the ugliest moments in William's experiences were balanced by examples of some of Raleigh's citizens, both black and white, demonstrating their most altruistic and beautiful essence.

[73] William Campbell, phone interview by the author; Ron Cornwall, "Throng at Campbell Rites," 1, 2.

William Campbell's road to Murphey Elementary School included what he termed a "caravan of civil rights leaders."[74] Dedicated African American citizens provided support for Campbell on his way to school to help protect the seven-year-old boy from facing violence. Among the most consistent supporters were two Shaw University professors who had previously provided encouragement to sit-in demonstrators, Marguerite Adams and Grady Davis. According to William's sister Mildred, school officials would only allow his mother to actually escort William from the car to the school door. But Davis and Adams were among those that would sit and wait in their car to ensure that William was not harassed. Ralph Campbell, Sr. was not able to walk William into the school due to having to be at his job with the Post Office. Thus, June Campbell courageously walked William up to the school door each day and often told William to keep his head down and count the steps up to the school.[75] For both June and Ralph Campbell, the decision to put their child in harm's way and face the potential psychological trauma of threats and abuse, demonstrated a major commitment to improving opportunities for African Americans. As William later pointed out, "Nothing could show the courage and commitment more than sacrificing your children."[76]

The excruciating reality for June and Ralph Campbell was that once William was inside of Murphey Elementary School, there was little they could do to protect him. And the impact of children growing up in a segregated society reared its ugly head inside of the walls of the school. William recalls that many of the students despised him. While

[74] William Campbell, phone interview by the author.
[75] Mildred (Campbell) Christmas, phone interview by the author.
[76] William Campbell, phone interview by the author.

he did not suffer from any physical violence that resulted in serious injuries, certain students tripped and pushed him. After his first year at Murphey, he continued on in grades three through six and had some teachers that were not very supportive. He described his five years at the school as a "long, hard slog."[77] But despite the malice that came from certain students and even teachers during his time at Murphey, there were examples of affection and acceptance as well. He received support from the black cafeteria workers who would always go out of their way to ask him how he was doing and to encourage him. But it was a white woman who likely had the most positive impact on his transition to the new school in 1960. In his first year at the school, William was assigned to Nell Abbott's class. He later characterized her as warm, loving, and caring. She went out of her way to treat him the same as everyone else, but she also kept a close watch on him to ensure that other students were not harassing him. Her support was encouraging and provided William with an environment that helped him succeed in the classroom. In William's first year, his fellow classmates did not know what to expect and many had been conditioned to believe that blacks were intellectually inferior. His academic success in his first year "crushed the notion that they (white students) were superior."[78]

On November 8, 1960, the same day that Terry Sanford was elected as governor over Republican candidate Robert Gavin, more than four hundred parents of Murphey Elementary School students asked the Raleigh Board of Education to reassign William Campbell to another school. Several parents had already made separate complaints and

[77] William Campbell, phone interview by the author.
[78] William Campbell, phone interview by the author.

about fifty had asked for reassignment for their children. Parents had complained to the school board about the children playing "circle games" in which they had to hold hands with each other, and thus, white children were holding hands with William Campbell. Present at the meeting in which the request was made for Campbell's reassignment was none other than Dr. I. Beverly Lake. The group claimed that they were not asking for reassignment of Campbell on the grounds of race but for the good of the community. Part of the petition submitted to the school board stated: "We residents of the attendance area of Murphey School in the city of Raleigh believe the integration of the school will not be for the best interests of the children in its attendance area and will decrease the values of the residential and business properties in the area."[79] Ultimately, the request for Campbell's transfer was denied.

The results of the gubernatorial election and the integration of schools were interrelated in a political as well as personal way. The campaign of I. Beverly Lake made it clear that he would have opposed integration vehemently if he were elected. But there was a personal aspect to Sanford's election as governor that had an impact on school integration. In a fateful coincidence, Murphey Elementary School was only about a block away from the Governor's Mansion. Thus, Sanford had to make the important decision whether to allow his children to attend a school that had recently accepted a black student, or to have his children attend a private school. He ultimately decided to allow his two children to attend Murphey, stressing that his children should have no more

[79] "Negro Student Transfer Sought," *News and Observer*, 9 November 1960, 30.

privileges than other students.[80] Just as Sanford had made the political decision to emphasize improving public education over stressing segregation in the schools, after being elected Sanford made the personal decision to allow his children to attend a public school that included the only black student in the city attending a formerly all-white school. Whether he viewed it in such terms or not, the implication was clear: in both political and personal ways, Terry Sanford emphasized education over segregation.

By the end of 1960, the impact of the sit-in movement in North Carolina was evident in both tangible and immeasurable ways. In Raleigh and Durham, student activists from the "Protest Triangle" increased the consciousness of African Americans in the two cities by enhancing support for challenging segregation. They provided a spark for resuscitating organizations like the Raleigh Citizens Association in Raleigh and pushing the Durham Committee on Negro Affairs to take a more aggressive approach to integration. In Raleigh, the response to the sit-in movement impacted school integration and influenced the Campbell family in their efforts. As William Campbell later noted, the sit-ins "set a standard" and "paved the way for more thoughtful integration."[81] In a general sense, the sit-in movement in North Carolina had galvanized support from some white religious leaders and also members of the academic community in the form of white and black college students and professors. In the most direct impact, the sit-in movement was primarily responsible for the integration of several lunch counters throughout the state by the end of 1960. By early August, integration in some eating places had taken place in Winston-Salem, Charlotte, Greensboro, High Point, and

[80] Washington AP, "Sanford Talks on Integration in TV Forum," *News and Observer*, 23 January 1961, 1.
[81] William Campbell, phone interview by the author.

Durham. On August 1, 1960, African Americans in Durham were served at S.H. Kress, F.W Woolworth, and Walgreen's Drug Store. By mid-August, several lunch counters in Raleigh began offering service on an integrated basis. According to the Southern Regional Council, integrated lunch counter service had taken place in at least twenty-seven southern cities by mid-August, including ten cities in North Carolina.[82]

The sit-in movement in 1960 also had an impact on the 1960 gubernatorial election. By inadvertently influencing I. Beverly Lake's decision to run for governor, student activists helped set the scene for a Democratic primary run-off that, while not devoid of other issues, largely boiled down to education vs. segregation. Terry Sanford, while far from publicly condemning segregation, emphasized improving public education in the state, while Lake focused on vehemently defending segregated schools. Whether the movement helped clinch Sanford's victory is debatable, but student activism and the increasing push for integration had influenced the gubernatorial election nonetheless. And Sanford's election ultimately led to the governor's children attending an integrated school, a reality that was difficult to imagine in many southern states in 1960. Just as the sit-in movement impacted the 1960 gubernatorial election, so would Sanford's victory impact the reaction to the sit-in movement when it reached a second and more widespread wave in 1963.

In the speech referenced at the beginning of this chapter, State Board of Education Chairman Dallas Herring stated in the days before the run-off election between Sanford

---

[82] "Integrated Lunch Counters: Durham Fifth N.C. City," *News and Observer*, 2 August 1960, 3; "Let Us March On: Raleigh's Journey Toward Civil Rights" (Raleigh City Museum: Raleigh, 2000), 14; Atlanta AP, "27 Southern Cities Now Serve Negroes," *News and Observer*, 7 August 1960, 2-II.

and Lake that "reaction was never characteristic of the people of North Carolina" in the struggle for liberty. This statement also seemed to be a shot at Lake, and Herring's contention that education "will always be the basic ingredient of our progress" was a pretty clear endorsement for Sanford, who emphasized improvements in education above all other matters.[83] Sanford's victory was an important indicator that a campaign focused primarily around maintaining racial segregation was not a winning strategy in North Carolina in 1960. It was also symbolic of the reality that many North Carolinians (yet certainly not all) were willing to support a candidate who would likely have lost in states like Mississippi, Georgia, or even Arkansas. From his pulpit at Pullen Memorial Baptist Church less than two weeks before the run-off election, Reverend W.W. Finlator warned that if Lake were elected, "The Faubuses and Talmadges and the Eastlands will rejoice that at long last they have one of their own kind at the helm of North Carolina."[84] Finlator recognized the power that men like Arkansas Governor Orval Faubus, and U.S. Senators Herman Talmadge (Georgia) and James Eastland (Mississippi) had in leading opposition to desegregation and calls for expanded civil rights for African Americans. There was a clear difference between these staunch defenders of segregation and Sanford. While Sanford was far from being an advocate of integration in 1960, his lack of emphasis on the issue in the 1960 election left the door open for a more progressive stance on civil rights than that of his predecessors and nearly all of his contemporaries in Southern politics.

---

[83] "Herring Says: Forces of Reaction Threaten Education," 34.
[84] "Pastor Hits Lake Candidacy," 22.

"There is a new day in North Carolina! I am not here to proclaim it, but rather to acknowledge its arrival," Sanford pronounced at the beginning of his inauguration speech on January 5, 1961.[85] The event was held at Raleigh's Memorial Auditorium, the same site in which Martin Luther King, Jr. spoke in the midst of the Youth Leadership Conference at Shaw University less than ninth months prior. Sanford's inaugural address took a forward-looking approach to the possibilities in the state. Not surprisingly, he emphasized improving education in the state: "I believe that the people of this state will rise in boldness and will go forward in determination that we have chosen wisely when we base our future hopes on quality education."[86] He also presented a forward-looking view that envisioned North Carolina taking a leadership role in the nation and did not present a parochial regional view that vilified the national government like many southern politicians did at the time. "Today we stand at the head of the South, but that is not enough. I want North Carolina to move into the mainstream of America and to strive to become the leading state of the nation."[87]

Sanford's inaugural address stands in stark contrast to Alabama Governor George Wallace's inaugural address two years later. Wallace harkened to the past, invoking the memory of Jefferson Davis and Robert E. Lee, and claimed that he spoke from the "very Heart of the Great Anglo-Saxon Southland." He portrayed the South as being in a battle with federal power and asserted that "we give the word of a race of honor that we will tolerate their boot in our face no longer." Wallace spoke very little of actual plans to

---

[85] Memory F. Mitchell, ed., *Messages, Addresses and Public Papers of Terry Sanford, Governor of North Carolina, 1961-1965* (Raleigh: Council of State, State of North Carolina, 1966), 3.
[86] Mitchell, ed., *Messages, Addresses and Public Papers of Terry Sanford*, 6.
[87] Mitchell, ed., *Messages, Addresses and Public Papers of Terry Sanford*, 7.

improve education in the state. And, of course, he uttered the words that would become the rallying cry of many pro-segregation forces when he declared: "In the name of the greatest people that have ever trod this earth, I draw the line in the dust and toss the gauntlet before the feet of tyranny…and I say…segregation today…segregation tomorrow…segregation forever."[88] In contrast to Wallace, Sanford's address had neither segregationist rhetoric nor appeals to a past that valorized the resistance to federal power especially when it came to defending the rights of African Americans. Perhaps the clearest indication that Sanford would be a forward-looking governor who would not take a reactionary approach on the issue of race came when he proclaimed that "no group of our citizens can be denied the right to participate in the opportunities of first-class citizenship."[89]

Upon exiting Memorial Auditorium after his inaugural address, Sanford could look to his right and see the historic campus of Shaw University. Whether he realized it or not, the actions of the students on the campus and those at the other historically black colleges had had an impact on the election. In early 1961, it remained unclear what impact the students at Shaw and the other historically black campuses would have during his term as governor. Many African Americans in Raleigh and throughout the state were encouraged that Sanford had triumphed over a strong advocate of segregation. Sanford himself had said that his election showed that "an appeal to fear, hate and social prejudice

[88] George C. Wallace, "The Inaugural Address of Governor George C. Wallace," Montgomery, Alabama, 14 January 1963, Alabama Department of Archives and History, available at: http://digital.archives.alabama.gov/cdm/ref/collection/voices/id/2952
[89] Mitchell, ed., *Messages, Addresses and Public Papers of Terry Sanford*, 8.

will not win an election" in the state.[90] His decision to have his children attend an integrated school provided hope that African Americans might be able to count him as an ally, or at a minimum, not a foe, in the struggle for integration and improved opportunities for members of their race. But like other African Americans and sympathetic whites throughout the state, the students at Shaw University recognized that Terry Sanford, or any other prominent figure for that matter, would not "bestow" freedom upon them.[91] If Sanford or any other political leaders in the state were going to take a strong stand on the side of civil rights for African Americans, student activists would have to pressure them to do so.

[90] Charles Craven, "Sanford Hopes Race Question Laid To Rest," *News and Observer*, 28 June 1960, 1.
[91] See appendix for survey responses.

CHAPTER VI

CAMPUS TO COUNTER

More than five hundred protestors marched from Shaw University to the governor's mansion in Raleigh on May 10, 1963. They clapped their hands and sang freedom songs outside the mansion, which was heard by Governor Terry Sanford while the North Carolina Symphony ball was in progress inside. In addition to the festive singing, the protestors chanted, "We want the Governor" for nearly twenty minutes. Sanford walked out onto the porch and told the protestors, "I have enjoyed the singing." One of the protestors then shouted, "We are not here to entertain you, Governor." Sanford responded, "You are not here at my request, either friend…. If you want to talk to me at any time about your plans and your problems, let my office know." A protestor then shouted that Sanford "should have known our troubles." Boos followed the governor as he walked back into the mansion, and Shaw student body president Charles Earle told the crowd, "He said we did not come here at his request. Since we are not here at his request, we are going to stay anyway." Earle's statement was more figurative than literal. Shortly after making the comment, the group marched back to Shaw University. But there was little doubt that the protestors would continue to challenge Sanford's tentative dance on the issue of integration.[1]

---

[1] Bob Lynch and Roy Parker, Jr., "Negroes Boo Gov. at Mansion," *News and Observer*, 11 May 1963, 1. A UPI article in the *Durham Sun* reported the crowd at 1,000: Raleigh UPI, "1000 March on Mansion: Negroes Finally Leave After Interrupting Ball," *Durham Sun*, 11 May 1963, 1.

The incident at the governor's mansion was in many ways emblematic of the movement in Raleigh and helps to illuminate the arguments that I will make in this chapter. Many of the protestors at the governor's mansion were part of a new wave of demonstrations in 1963, which put increasing pressure on political and business leaders in the city and the state to support integration. Students from Shaw University and Saint Augustine's College in Raleigh and North Carolina College in Durham who participated in sit-ins literally went from campus to counter (or table) at segregated eating establishments, in addition to segregated theaters. But my primary argument is that these students also were the principal force that countered the established political and business leaders who had preserved segregated practices in the state for so long. The student activists clearly sought to oppose the die-hard supporters of segregation. But they also sought to counteract the tentative "moderate" leaders, who on the issue of race relations could be considered anything but leaders.[2] They used protests to challenge white political and business leaders who appealed to tradition to preserve archaic social and economic practices at the expense of African American civil rights. They challenged the complicated hospitality that existed throughout the state that denied fellow American citizens full access to public accommodations and quality job opportunities on the basis of race. In short, the activists challenged a segregationist vision of Tar Heel hospitality.

The protest at the governor's mansion further demonstrates that Shaw University was the epicenter of civil rights activism in Raleigh. It was also an indicator that civil rights activists no longer accepted Sanford's tentative dance on civil rights issues. Their

[2] See Survey (Students) in appendix.

involvement in protests in the spring and summer of 1963 also presented a direct challenge to city political leaders and businessmen who sought to preserve segregated practices. Since Raleigh is the capital of North Carolina, the local movement for integration also had statewide implications. Sanford could not ignore the local movement, nor could state legislators who witnessed the demonstrations first hand. Several business leaders were opposed to integration based upon simple prejudice, but many were skeptical of integration due to economic concerns. Many business leaders were willing to integrate only if all of their competitors did so as well. Student civil rights activists and their allies recognized that they needed to keep the pressure on the businesses to integrate, and sit-ins were among the most aggressive and effective practices to do so.[3]

This chapter focuses primarily on civil rights activism in Raleigh and Durham in 1963, which was a crucial year for civil rights protests in the two cities and throughout the nation. Before analyzing that important year, I will address some of the activism and changes in conditions for African Americans that took place in 1961 and 1962 and illuminate some of the changes that occurred between 1960 and 1963.

In May of 1961, John Winters became the first African American to be elected to the Raleigh City Council. Throughout the state, black voter registration was much lower than that of whites. In 1960, only 31 percent of African Americans in the state were registered to vote, compared with 90 percent of whites.[4] But Winters's election

---

[3] Mack Junior Sowell, interview by the author, digital recording, 20 April 2016, Raleigh, North Carolina; Richmond, Va. AP, "Negotiating Integration at Durham," *News and Observer*, 3 June 1963, 1.
[4] Roy Parker, Jr., "Registered Electorate of N.C. Said Disproportionately White," *News and Observer*, 11 June 1961, 1.

represented a major victory for the mobilization of African American voting in the city. Black voters had played a crucial role in defeating the staunch segregationist I. Beverly Lake in his gubernatorial bid in 1960, and now they had another tangible victory on the local level.

Perhaps the most significant examples of civil rights activism in 1961 occurred during the Freedom Rides, in which black and white "riders" challenged segregated bus terminals and facilities. The riders tested the enforcement (or lack thereof) of U.S. Supreme Court decisions in *Sarah Keys v. Carolina Coach Company* (1955) and *Boynton v. Virginia* (1960) which had ostensibly banned segregation in interstate busses and in bus terminals and restaurants. Two of the groups of riders stopped in Raleigh in mid-June and were welcomed by Dr. Grady Davis, the dean of religion at Shaw University. One group, which was comprised of eight white and six black Protestant ministers along with four rabbis, spent the night at Shaw University before continuing on to Tallahassee, Florida.[5] Some of the most influential riders who became nationally known figures in the civil rights movement had also attended the Youth Leadership Conference in April 1960, including John Lewis, Diane Nash, and Bernard LaFayette. Another one of the riders, Candida Lall, was an eighteen-year-old white student from Long Beach State College in California, who in January 1963 married Durham civil rights activist Walter Riley.[6]

Riley was among the activists who sought to bring about the end to segregation at the Raleigh-Durham airport. In 1961, the airport still had signs pointing people to the

[5] "Pass Through, No Incidents: Two 'Freedom' Groups Here," *News and Observer*, 14 June 1961, 24.
[6] "Delegates to Youth Leadership Conference," 2 June 1960, Box 25, Folder 1, SNCC Papers, Martin Luther King Jr. Center for Nonviolent Social Change, Atlanta Georgia; Walter Riley, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 4 June 2016.

segregated bathrooms, although this separation was not strictly enforced by that time. The Durham Youth and College Chapters of the NAACP led the push. North Carolina College (NCC) student John Edwards, who had taken a leadership role in the sit-ins in 1960, telephoned airport commission chairman James Patton in early October urging the end to segregated facilities at the airport. Patton stated that there was little he could do since the state required segregated toilet facilities. Edward (Ned) Opton, a white Duke University Ph.D. student active in the NAACP state youth chapter, called another member of the airport authority, Dillard Teer, and told him of their plans to wire President Kennedy if the signs were not removed. Evidently, Teer responded by saying, "You can wire the President or any damn body you please."[7] The decision to contact Kennedy was strategic and timely, as Kennedy had plans to land at the airport to open the North Carolina International Trade Fair. The warning by the young NAACP activists was not an empty threat. They wired Kennedy the following message:

> Racial segregation is practiced at the Raleigh-Durham airport, at which you are scheduled to open the North Carolina International Trade Fair on Oct. 12, 1961. The Chairman of the Airport Board of Control, Mr. Patton, has refused to remove the offensive racial signs from the airport rest rooms. We urge you, as the leader of our democracy, to decline to open an international trade fair within the wall of a state facility where African delegates, as well as members of your staff, would be subject to embarrassment and possible arrest.

In response, U.S. Assistant Attorney General Burke Marshall sent a telegram to the airport manager, which stated, "We would accordingly appreciate prompt action to remove these signs in compliance with federal law." Members of the airport authority

[7] "Kennedy Erases Jim Crow Signs," *Carolina Times*, 14 October 1961, 1, 2.

met and voted to comply with the request. Ultimately, the signs were removed, and State Attorney General Wade Bruton gave the opinion that the state law requiring segregated toilet facilities could no longer be enforced.[8]

The irony and symbolism of the controversy over the segregation signs in the preparation for the international trade fair could not have been more striking. Like other Cold War-era presidents, Kennedy mostly viewed civil rights issues in an international sense, and it was often the fear of international embarrassment and concerns over losing the Cold War propaganda battle that pushed Kennedy into action. But in a more direct sense, it was the actions of local black and white student activists like Edwards and Opton that led to the Kennedy administration requesting the segregation signs to be removed. The situation made it clear that the young civil rights leaders in the Triangle recognized that Kennedy could be an ally, but only when pushed. They already had experience with a liberal who was cautious on the issue of civil rights from their indirect dealings with Terry Sanford. Young black activists like Edwards and Riley, and sympathetic white activists like Opton, were keenly aware that they had to counter the defenders of segregation, such as the airport authorities who either supported segregation outright or claimed impotence to make changes. But the most insightful student leaders in the movement also realized that they had to counter the excuses, delay tactics, and tentative leadership that often characterized their intermittent allies like Kennedy and Sanford.[9]

---

[8] Ibid.; "Pardon, Your Signs Are Showing," *The Campus Echo*, 27 October 1961, 2.
[9] Edward Opton, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 11 April 2016; Walter Riley, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 14 June 2016. Also see Thomas Borstelmann, *The Cold War and*

In the wake of the airport situation, Opton was elected president of the state youth chapter of the NAACP. Opton's leadership in pushing for desegregating the airport was far from his first action toward desegregation in the Triangle. After graduating from Yale in 1957, Opton chose Duke over another prestigious school, Syracuse University in Syracuse, New York. One of the factors for why he chose Duke was due to the fact that there were opportunities to challenge segregation. According to Opton, in 1958 he drew up a petition to the Duke trustees to allow African Americans to enroll in the school, and circulated the document among the students and faculty. The administration told him that many of the trustees were Methodist ministers and that a vote to desegregate would mean the end of their careers. Opton recalls that a few faculty members signed his petition, but that a larger number refused. Blatant prejudice certainly accounted for some of those who refused, but others were fearful of losing their jobs. Hence, the looming threat of termination represented a restriction on the faculty's academic freedom. Many faculty members from Duke were reluctant to take a principled stand for desegregation in the late 1950s. But in the wake of the sit-ins and other demonstrations in the early 1960s, the moral imperative to take a stronger stand grew.[10]

Opton himself participated in sit-ins and efforts aimed at desegregating theaters. He recalled one instance in which he was chased down by the owner of a cafeteria on Main Street in Durham, not far from the law of office of Floyd McKissick. McKissick had played a major role in Opton's ascension to becoming the state NAACP youth leader.

---

the Color Line: American Race Relations in the Global Arena (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001).

[10] Edward Opton, phone interview by the author.

Opton developed connections with African American protest leaders in Durham and those from NCC. Walter Riley, the Hillside High School student who had become one of the most significant leaders by 1961, characterized the white Duke student as one of the most important leaders in the Durham movement. For Riley, Opton was symbolic of the increasing white support for direct challenges to segregation, which ultimately became even stronger by 1963.[11] Opton also represented a critical connection between the private "Research Triangle" school (Duke) and the "Protest Triangle" public school (North Carolina College).

Duke University was still one of the bastions of segregation in the early 1960s. Despite the actions of Opton and some other Duke students who pushed for desegregation in public accommodations and at the University, the school remained closed to African Americans until 1961. In March 1961, the Board of Trustees resolved that qualified candidates of all races be allowed into graduate and professional programs.[12] This action was a step toward integrating the undergraduate program, but the push for the broader integration of the school (including undergraduates) continued. Zoology professor Peter Klopfer was one of the members of the faculty who most forcefully advocated for Duke to change its policies. Jake Phelps, who was a UNC student and writer for the *Durham Morning Herald* in the early 1960s, contends that "there was no gutsier or grittier contender in either the external struggle or internal

[11] Edward Opton, phone interview by the author; Walter Riley, phone interview by the author.
[12] Len Pardue and Galen Griffin, "Grad Schools Desegregated," *The Chronicle* (Duke University student newspaper), 8 March 1961, 1, Box 1, Folder 2, Black History at Duke Reference Collection, 1948-2001, David M. Rubenstein Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.

struggle than Peter Klopfer."[13] In January 1962, Klopfer proposed to the Undergraduate Faculty Council a strong pro-integration resolution addressed to the trustees. The trustees ultimately responded favorably to the resolution later that year. The first five black undergraduate students entered Duke University in the fall of 1963.[14]

While the process of securing support for integration at Durham's most prestigious college played out, student activists continued to challenge segregation in Raleigh and Durham. In Raleigh, one of the vestiges of municipal segregation remained at the for-whites-only Pullen Park. In early August 1962, Shaw University ministerial student Percy High led a group of four African Americans who attempted to integrate the pool. Ray Raphael, a nineteen-year-old white man of Portland, Oregon, purchased tickets for the group. High stated simply, "It was a hot day and we decided to go swimming."[15] Eleanor Nunn, who was one of the student representatives at the 1960 Youth Leadership Conference at Shaw and the president of the Shaw chapter of the NAACP by 1963, echoed High's straightforward reasoning: "They had all the reason they needed to go in the pool. It was a hot day." The group of swimmers included students from the Deep South and from the North. High rejected the idea that they were outside agitators: "Why shouldn't they be entitled to swim at a public pool in Raleigh? They are Americans."[16]

---

[13] Jake Phelps, "Integration in North Carolina: An Outside Agitator Looks Back," *Ruby* (Duke University's Fiftieth Anniversary Issue), 12 April 1975, 1B, Box 1, "Desegregation" Folder, Black History at Duke Reference Collection, 1948-2001.
[14] "First Black Undergraduate Students," Box 1, Folder 3, Black History at Duke Reference Collection, 1948-2001.
[15] Raleigh AP, "City Pools in Raleigh Are Closed," *Durham Sun*, 7 August 1962, 3A.
[16] Gene Roberts, Jr., "A Look at the Negro Student: Thunder on the Campus: Protest on Mainstreet," *News and Observer*, 3 March 1963, Section III, 1.

After the group of swimmers refused to leave, City Recreation Director Jimmy Chambers ordered the pool to be closed. He also ordered the city's pool for African Americans at Chavis Park to be closed. The Raleigh City Council voted 5-2 in favor of closing the pools, with the only dissenting votes coming from John Coffey, and the council's lone black member, John Winters. Mayor William Enloe said that he felt integration of the public pools would be unacceptable to the public. He reasoned that it was not up to the city council to decide whether it was right or wrong, but whether it would be acceptable.[17] Enloe's logic was classic Tar Heel hospitality—feigning concern for African Americans but ultimately hiding behind archaic social customs that made municipal government an accomplice to preserving traditions that were untenable in an effective democracy.

Shaw University students sought to counter the mentality that preserved segregation, and Percy High was among those at the forefront of this effort. He was involved in the mass demonstration at the Howard Johnson restaurant on August 21, 1962, in which approximately three hundred protestors arriving in about sixty cars converged on the segregated restaurant on Highway One North. The Raleigh Citizens Association, the Raleigh Women's Voters Council, the NAACP, and the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) had sponsored the demonstrations. Prior to the picketing outside of the restaurant, the protestors had met at the black First Baptist Church in Raleigh, where they received a prayer from Reverend C.W. Ward. High also gave remarks, and one of the speakers described High as "another Martin Luther." The mass meeting was

[17] "City's Pools in Raleigh Are Closed," *Durham Sun*, 7 August 1962, 3A.

symbolic of the movement, as it revealed an amalgamation of various local and national civil rights groups and enjoyed support from local black religious leaders. It was also emblematic of the crucial role that Shaw University students played in the movement that was about to reach its zenith in the following year. The slogan of one of the protestors at the mass meeting seemed to portend the apex of the movement against segregation in Raleigh and throughout the South: "Free by 63."[18]

The actions of civil rights protestors in Raleigh and Durham in 1961 and 1962 were in many ways a continuation of increased activism that had been sparked by the sit-in movement. But in many respects, 1963 represented a new "wave" of mass protests in the two cities and throughout the South that was even more dynamic than those in 1960. In 1960, much of the focus of the protests had been chain stores that operated lunch counters within the broader store that permitted black customers to shop but denied them from sitting at the lunch counters. Thus, the contradictions of segregation were right there in the store itself. By 1963, activists targeted a wider range of establishments and focused even more on opening economic opportunities for African Americans. By the end of 1960, some desegregation of lunch counters had occurred in the two cities, and further desegregation had occurred by the end of 1962.[19] But even greater changes came by the end of 1963, largely a result of mass protests and individual acts of courage. 1960 was a watershed moment in the history of nonviolent civil rights activism in the U.S., but 1963 represented its zenith.

---

[18] "300 March on Raleigh Howard Johnson: Vigorous Protest Begun By RCA, RWVC, NAACP, CORE," *Carolinian*, 25 August 1962, 1, 2.
[19] Charles Craven, "Mayor Enloe Will Resign Today," *News and Observer*, 9 April 1963, 1; "Integrated Lunch Counters: Durham Fifth City," *News and Observer*, 2 August 1960, 3.

Student protestors attending Shaw University and Saint Augustine's College in 1963 recognized that white political leaders would not "bestow" freedom upon them. The African American students understood that business and political leaders would have to be pressured to make changes to segregated practices.[20] One of the strategies utilized by protestors to pressure movie theaters into desegregating was to approach the ticket windows in pairs and ask for tickets for seating in the sections reserved for whites. When they were refused, they would simply return to the end of the line and repeat the process. Hence, the protestors not only made a stand that segregation was morally wrong, but by creating a long line, the protestors were in effect discouraging white patrons from attending the theaters. This practice, often referred to as "rotation" or "round robin," was not unique to Raleigh. But the targeting of one of the theaters in Raleigh demonstrated the strategic aspect of certain demonstrations. Protestors especially targeted the Ambassador Theater, not only due to its segregated policies, but because Raleigh Mayor Enloe was the manager of the theater and district manager of North Carolina Theater, Inc., a group which owned the Ambassador Theater.[21]

Demonstrations at the Ambassador Theater put Enloe in a precarious position. Police estimated four hundred protested outside of the theater, mostly from Shaw University and Saint Augustine's College, on April 8, 1963. The protests nearly caused Enloe to resign his position as mayor, and he claimed "Bill Enloe could do things concerning his business that would be of local interest only, but Mayor Bill Enloe would

[20] See Survey (Students) in appendix.
[21] Charles Craven, "Mayor Enloe Will Resign Today," *News and Observer*, 9 April 1963, 1; Jonathan Friendly, "76 Business Firms Here Integrating, *News and Observer*, 6 June 1963, 1, 3.

make front page headlines statewide, if not nationwide."[22] Last minute negotiations with adult African American leaders caused Enloe to change his mind and remain as mayor. Davie Street Presbyterian Church pastor Oscar McCloud told him that it was likely that the students would eventually stop. Nonetheless, the protests continued. Enloe stated that he was not opposed to picketing but was opposed to students blocking white patrons' access to the box office, calling such tactics "vicious." Shaw University student protest leader Charles Earle denied that the demonstrations were vicious, claiming that only the young white men that heckled the protestors were vicious.[23]

As mayor and as an important business official in the capital city, Enloe was in a position to exhibit leadership and help set a new vision for Tar Heel hospitality which accepted integration, but he mostly failed to do so. Raleigh did not have a city ordinance requiring segregation in establishments that served both races. In 1963, Raleigh only had one local ordinance mandating segregation, and it required segregated cemeteries.[24] Thus, Enloe could have advocated for integration at the Ambassador Theater and encouraged other establishments to follow suit. On the same day that protestors marched to the governor's mansion, Shaw graduate and North Carolina Teachers Association (a black teacher organization) Executive Secretary Dr. Charles Lyons met with Enloe and white business leaders. Lyons stated, "We came from that meeting not greatly encouraged as to where we were." Later that day, Lyons spoke to a crowd of some five hundred at Shaw University auditorium, in which he claimed that "the students are

[22] "Mayor Keeps Post: Picketing Continues," *News and Observer,* 10 April 1963, 1.
[23] "Enloe's Statement to Council," *News and Observer,* 11 April 1963, 31; "Enloe 'Symbol,' Not Target of Protests," *News and Observer,* 11 April 1963, 31.
[24] David Cooper, "Sit-In Laws Struck Down: No Court Answer on Trespass Arrests," *News and Observer*, 21 May 1963, 1.

prepared to go back on the streets."[25] By not taking a strong stand in favor of integration as mayor, Enloe was similar to many political leaders throughout the state that ultimately put the ball in the court of individual businesses to voluntarily integrate. As a businessman, he made little effort to set a precedent for others to follow.

In the face of the tentative city leadership, students from Shaw and Saint Augustine's College also targeted businesses in the city that catered to state political leaders. A specific target of protests was the Sir Walter Hotel and Coffee House. The Sir Walter was one of the sites in which ninety-two protestors were arrested for trespassing in Raleigh on May 8, 1963, the first mass arrests since the new wave of protests began in April.[26] A major reason that demonstrators targeted the Sir Walter, in addition to its segregated practices, was due to the hotel serving as the primary lodging site for members of the state legislature. Thus, it was an ideal target for challenging segregation and the lawmakers that upheld the practices, or at the least, were tentative in challenging segregation.

June 10, 1963 was one of the most significant evenings of the direct-action movement in Raleigh. Six young African Americans entered the lobby of the Sir Walter Hotel and applied for rooms. Hotel manager Arthur Buddenhagen told them that the hotel did not accommodate "Negroes" and asked them to leave. The group of six refused to leave and sat down in the lobby. Buddenhagen called the police and they were

---

[25] Jonathan Friendly, "Truce Efforts Too Slow, Leaders of Negroes Say," *News and Observer,* 11 May 1963, 1.
[26] Bob Lynch, "92 Negroes Arrested Here: County Jail Filled With Demonstrators," *News and Observer,* 9 May 1963, 1.

arrested for trespassing.[27] Buddenhagen's actions and the hotel's refusal to accommodate African Americans represented the ugly side of southern hospitality.

The arrests on June 10 did not deter the protestors. In fact, after they were taken to the police station and fingerprinted and cited to appear in court, the six arrested protestors returned to the hotel where they joined an increasing number of protestors who sat on their suitcases outside the hotel. Shaw University student leaders Charles Earle and Mack Junior Sowell claimed that the protestors planned to stay there "from now on." Around midnight, the demonstrators sang out, "Tell Mayor Enloe we will not be moved," a refrain that they repeated and replaced with the same message to Governor Sanford and the Legislature. In a 2016 interview, Mack Sowell asserted that the protestors' goal throughout the demonstrations was to pressure those in power to make changes, and he recognized that "we had to have pressure on them to make the changes."[28] The young protestors confronted the business leaders in the city who upheld segregation. And just as they had done a month prior at the governor's mansion, they directly challenged the political leadership that more often than not served the interests of segregated businesses at the expense of African American civil rights.

Perhaps the most egregious act on June 10 at the Sir Walter was when a hotel patron threw a bag of water on the demonstrators from an upper floor. There is no indication that the perpetrator was a state legislator, but an equally appalling moment occurred that day, which did involve a legislator. After a verbal exchange with one of the

---

[27] Bob Lynch, "Negroes 'Sit-In' at Sir Walter," *News and Observer*, 11 June 1963, 1.
[28] Bob Lynch, "Negroes 'Sit-In' at Sir Walter," *News and Observer*, 11 June 1963, 1; Mack Junior Sowell, phone interview by the author.

protestors, the unidentified legislator claimed that he would do something about the African American protestors, stating, "I'd cut off their school appropriations." The legislator's comment was consistent with segregationist politicians who sought to restrict the freedom of students to become involved in protests. But his comments were also ironic due to the fact that the majority of the protestors in Raleigh were students at Shaw University and Saint Augustine's College, which were private historically black colleges. Perhaps demonstrating his frustration over an inability to thwart the protests, the legislator said to the protestor, "There is one thing in my power. I can slap hell out of you," as he drew a rolled-up newspaper to potentially hit the protestor but was discouraged by another legislator.[29]

African Americans comprised the majority of the protestors at the Sir Walter Hotel on June 10. But it is noteworthy that the protestor whom the legislator threatened to hit was a white UNC student, Ken Bode. Whites became increasingly involved in civil rights activism in 1963, and in the Triangle much of the support came from students at the Research Triangle schools. UNC student Pat Cusick also participated in the demonstrations at the Sir Walter Hotel. Along with John Dunne, Cusick became one of the most significant leaders of the push for integration in Chapel Hill in 1963 and 1964. Without a historically black college and with the state's preeminent public institution, the movement in Chapel Hill was much different than in Raleigh or Durham. But Cusick's involvement in civil rights activism in Raleigh was just one example of the interconnections among movements in the Triangle. UNC assistant professor of

[29] Bob Lynch, "Negroes 'Sit-In' at Sir Walter," *News and Observer*, 11 June 1963, 1.

psychology Albert Ammons was also at the protests on June 10 in Raleigh. Ammons consistently participated in the demonstrations in Chapel Hill in 1963, and on January 3, 1964, he was severely beaten by customers and employees at Watts Grill in Chapel Hill. He died from a brain aneurysm several months later, although it was not proven to be related to the beating.[30] In the ostensibly progressive college town, this attack was an ugly example of the lengths to which some whites would go to preserve a segregationist vision of Tar Heel hospitality.

Some white faculty members in the Research Triangle schools played a significant role in the push for integration in the region and offered support for black students. David Dansby, an African American student at UNC, recalls that his faculty advisor, Dr. Dan Pollitt, was essential in starting a campus NAACP chapter at UNC. Dansby served as president of the campus NAACP and ultimately graduated from the UNC graduate school in 1964. Dansby had been the lone representative from UNC at the historic Youth Leadership Conference at Shaw University in April 1960 and became the first African American to receive an undergraduate degree from UNC in 1961. He initially did not have many white allies, but began to receive increasing support from white faculty, staff, and students in 1963. He also received support from Anne Queen, the campus YWCA-YMCA director, who made efforts to include African American students at the school in the activities of the organization.[31]

---

[30] Art Chansky, *Game Changers: Dean Smith, Charlie Scott, and the Era That Transformed a Southern College Town* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2016), 63.
[31] "First Negro Gets Degree at Carolina," *News and Observer,* 6 June 1961, 1; David Dansby, phone interview by the author, 14 June 2016.

Cautious support for integration in Chapel Hill also came from UNC assistant basketball coach Dean Smith. In 1959, Smith and the white Reverend Robert Seymour entered The Pines restaurant with a black theology student and received service. But events in 1963 revealed that The Pines and most other eating establishments remained segregated. Even after becoming head coach in 1961, Smith took a cautious approach to integration, largely due to his tenuous coaching status early in his career. By 1962, UNC had fifty-four black undergraduate students, and Smith attempted to recruit Dudley High School's (Greensboro) Lou Hudson, but UNC admissions denied him based on his SAT scores. Dansby recalls that he was among those who talked to Smith to try to get him to recruit black players. Ultimately, Smith landed Charlie Scott, the Harlem native and Laurinburg Institute (Laurinburg, North Carolina) alum who began his playing career at UNC in 1967 and became one of the all-time great Tar Heels. In *Game Changers: Dean Smith, Charlie Scott, and the Era that Transformed A Southern College Town,* Art Chansky asserts that "it's good that Charlie Scott wasn't born three years earlier. Chapel Hill was far less ready for him in the early 1960s."[32]

In Raleigh, African American civil rights activists received support from some students and faculty members at North Carolina State College. Allard Lowenstein was perhaps the most influential member of the faculty at NC State in terms of his contributions to the local movement for civil rights. A 1949 graduate of UNC, Lowenstein served as the third president of the National Student Association (NSA) from 1950-1951, an association that gave its support to student sit-ins in the early 1960s. In a

[32] David Dansby, phone interview by the author; Art Chansky, *Game Changers*, 27, 34, 36, 54.

speech in Oklahoma in December 1960, the former NSA president made it clear that he and the association supported the ending of racial barriers as part of America's responsibility. Lowenstein taught social science courses at NC State during his employment from 1962-1964. He made financial contributions to the campaign to re-elect John W. Winters, the only African American member of the Raleigh City Council. In the wake of the sit-ins at the Sir Walter Hotel, Lowenstein tried to encourage Eastern Air Lines to discourage their flight crews from lodging at the segregated hotel.[33]

Lowenstein had extensive contacts with both students at NC State and those at Shaw University and Saint Augustine's College. He discussed segregation issues in his classes at NC State, including surveying students on their perceptions of segregation and the potential impact of integration. NC State Chancellor John Tyler Caldwell called him an "extraordinary teacher," and he was chosen by students as one of three professors for the "Blue Key Award" for exceptional service to the school. In *The Pied Piper: Allard Lowenstein and the Liberal Dream*, Richard Cummings maintains that "Lowenstein figured prominently in a number of anti-segregation demonstrations climaxing with a march of about a thousand people to the governor's mansion." According to Caldwell, Lowenstein "was a regular Pied Piper. If he started saying anything to students, why they just followed him like the old Pied Piper."[34]

---

[33] Unsigned speech about Allard Lowenstein, Tulsa, Oklahoma, December 1960, Series 1, Box 28, Folder 985, Allard Lowenstein Papers, Southern Historical Collection, Louis Round Wilson Special Collections Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Frank L. Turner to Allard Lowenstein, 20 May 1963, Series 1 Box 8, Folder 289, Lowenstein Papers; Malcolm A. McIntyre to Allard Lowenstein, 5 July 1963, Series 1, Box 8, Folder 294, Lowenstein Papers.

[34] Richard Cummings, *The Pied Piper: Allard K. Lowenstein and the Liberal Dream* (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1985), 226, 257.

Shaw student protest leader Mack Sowell recalled that he and other students visited Lowenstein at his apartment. Lowenstein's interactions with black and white students were symbolic of the occasional interactions between the Research Triangle Schools and those of the "Protest Triangle." But Lowenstein's impact and that of other liberal whites should not be overemphasized in the push for integration in Raleigh. The sit-ins and other demonstrations were the primary force that was putting the pressure on businesspeople and city leaders to desegregate. In most cases, less than 10 percent of the demonstrators were white. In the survey question asking student respondents to rank the statement "White men and women played a significant role in the demonstrations in Raleigh" on a scale of one to ten, the average was only 2.33.[35]

The primary impetus for change came from the historically black colleges in Raleigh, at which participation in the demonstrations was common. Eleanor Nunn, one of the most significant student leaders and the president of the Shaw University chapter of the NAACP, estimated in the spring of 1963 that 60 to 70 percent of students at the college had participated in sit-ins, stand-ins, pray-ins, or other forms of protest at some point.[36] In my survey asking student respondents to rank certain groups and institutions in order of importance to their bringing about integration and increased employment opportunities for African Americans, nearly every respondent ranked the Shaw University/Saint Augustine's College student groups first.[37]

---

[35] Mack Junior Sowell, interview by the author; The 2.33 average response was for students in Raleigh only. See appendix for survey results that include Raleigh and Durham.
[36] Gene Roberts, Jr., "Thunder on the Campus: Protest on Mainstreet," 3 March 1963, Section III, 1.
[37] See appendix. The author acknowledges the capacity for bias in this instance but the point remains clear: students at the historically black colleges in Raleigh viewed their classmates as the crucial force in bringing

Most of the demonstrations in Raleigh had a communal aspect and protestors found comfort in the company of fellow protestors. But there were also acts of courage in which individuals took a stand against segregation on their own. Shaw student Charles Earle was one of the most significant leaders in the direct-action movement, but one of his most courageous actions was to apply to become a member at Raleigh's First Baptist Church. His application represented the first attempt to integrate the membership of a white Protestant church in the city. Earle maintained that his decision to apply "was a personal decision." He frequently attended the church, largely due to being inspired by the pastor, Dr. John Lewis, when he had spoken at Shaw University two years prior. While Earle claimed it was a personal decision, he also stated that the church "should be a leader in civil rights."[38] There is little reason to doubt that Earle was indeed primarily making a personal decision to join. Fellow Shaw student and protest leader Mack Sowell recalls that he was "shocked" when Earle applied for membership at the church.[39] Thus, Earle's decision to apply was not officially related to his leadership in the student protest movement, but he likely recognized that his action would draw attention in the community. On April 10, 1963, the same day that he stated that Mayor Enloe "is a symbol, not a target" of the protests at segregated theaters, Earle held that "I don't want them [First Baptist Church] to accept me as a Negro, as the president of the student body at Shaw, or anything else in particular … just accept me as Charles Earle."[40]

---

about integration in the city. And other evidence points to the reality that they were correct in that viewpoint.

[38] "First Baptist Receives Application of Negro," *News and Observer,* 8 April 1963, 1.

[39] Mack Junior Sowell, interview by the author.

[40] "Church Application Not Protest, Student Says," *News and Observer*, 11 April 1963, 11.

The decision on whether or not to integrate the membership of the church was symbolic of the underhanded ways in which certain institutions maintained segregated practices. Upon Earle's application, the deacon board chairman, R.N. Simms, Jr., told the congregation that unless there were any objections, the decision would be referred to the deacons. This strategy was different than how membership applications were usually handled, which was through an immediate vote by the congregation.[41] One of the church leaders playing a role in the decision was a WRAL television broadcaster and executive vice president, and former Raleigh city council member, Jesse Helms. Helm's *Viewpoints* editorials on WRAL beginning in November 1960 often opposed civil rights activism. The eventual U.S. Senator blamed white liberals for the civil rights movement and contrasted "responsible" blacks who accepted segregation with "irresponsible" blacks who had brought social disorder. According to historian William A. Link, in 1963 Helms opposed integration and offered a motion for the congregational vote that ultimately denied Charles Earle's application for membership at First Baptist.[42] Years later, Helms told reporters that he had merely stood up in front of the congregation to "move the previous question" to end the debate and hold a vote. But according to journalist Ernest B. Fergurson, Helms was strongly opposed to Earle's acceptance. While the deacons presented a façade of a democratic vote, it came only after they

[41] "First Baptist Recieves Application of Negro," *News and Observer,* 8 April 1963, 1.
[42] William A. Link, *Righteous Warrior: Jesse Helms and the Rise of Modern Conservatism* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2008), 70, 74, 127.

recommended the congregation deny Earle's membership. Ultimately, the congregation voted 367-147 in a secret vote against Earle's admission.[43]

The denial of Earle's membership exposed many realities about Raleigh in 1963. First and foremost, support for segregation was still common among many white citizens. But it also revealed that many whites found ways to deemphasize the legitimate grievances of African Americans who sought integration. One of the primary objections to accepting Earle was due to his status as one of the protest leaders.[44] Of course, he and the hundreds of other protestors only conducted protests because so many white citizens had taken a passive approach to segregation. In many cases, supporters of segregation presented a circular logic for maintaining segregation. For instance, Reverend Elias Stephanopoulos from Holy Trinity Greek Church abstained from a vote by members of the Raleigh Ministerial Association endorsing hotel and café integration. He argued, "Our churches are still segregated. We are asking other people to do something we haven't been able to do ourselves."[45] Of course, as the leader of his congregation, he could have taken a moral stand against segregation in his own church, which would have allowed him to also take a principled stand against segregation elsewhere.

African Americans in Raleigh made concerted efforts to integrate churches in the city on May 12, 1963. They were allowed to enter at most of the churches, but at Calvary Baptist Church, white men stood at the doorway and denied their entrance. The Reverend Earl Crumpler claimed, "It was obvious to some of us that they did not come in

---

[43] Ernest B. Fergurson, *Hard Right: The Rise of Jesse Helms* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1986), 227; Jane Hall, "Church Rejects Negro Applicant," *News and Observer*, 16 May 1963, 36.
[44] Fergurson, *Hard Right*, 227.
[45] "Cleric Group Backs Hotel, Café Mixing," *News and Observer*, 15 May 1963, 26.

the spirit of Christ." But Crumpler also stated that he sympathized with their goal and asserted, "The one place where there should be no prejudice is within the fellowship of the church … like the door of Heaven, the doors of every church should be open to all mankind."[46] Perhaps Crumpler truly believed the words he spoke, but it certainly seemed that he could have presented a more welcoming environment.

Despite the discouraging actions at First Baptist Church and Calvary Baptist Church, religious leaders were among the most sympathetic groups in supporting integration efforts. On May 14, 1963, the Raleigh Ministerial Association passed a resolution 42-1 calling for the immediate desegregation of restaurants, theaters, and hotels in the city. This action presented a much more official and pointed attack on segregation than the resolution that thirty ministers had signed three years prior in the wake of the 1960 sit-in movement, in which thirty ministers agreed to support any establishments that desegregated. The 1960 resolution was also not presented as an official Raleigh Ministers Association resolution. One of the pastors that supported both resolutions was Reverend W.W. Finlator of Pullen Memorial Baptist, who had been supportive of civil rights activism for many years.[47]

Ironically, the president of the Raleigh Ministers Association in 1963 was Dr. John Lewis from First Baptist Church, whose church denied the membership of Charles Earle two days later. Unlike many of the members of his congregation, Lewis had been in favor of accepting Earle as a member of the church. His support demonstrated the

[46] "Negroes Crowd Church Sunday: Turned Away From Calvary Baptist," *News and Observer,* 13 May 1963, 20.
[47] "Cleric Group Backs Hotel, Café Mixing," *News and Observer,* 15 May 1963, 26.

fissures in Raleigh over the issue of segregation that often existed within institutions, whether it was specific churches, business groups, or political organizations. Lewis laid out both sides of the argument in front of the congregation, but he clearly leaned toward admitting Earle. He pointed out that segregation was hurting foreign missions and that the New Testament said race should not be a qualification for membership. He then asked the question, "What would Jesus have me do?"[48] Perhaps the most poignant comment that Lewis made was also one that seemingly could have been stated to all opponents of integration and opponents of civil rights demonstrations. When some members of his church claimed about Earle, "He's just testing us," Lewis replied, "Right—let's pass the test."[49]

Lewis was not the only minister who took a principled stand against continued segregation in the city. Perhaps the boldest move taken by a white pastor on the issue of integration came from Reverend Dr. Albert Edwards of First Presbyterian Church. Edwards implored his congregation to write letters to restaurant owners encouraging them to support integration. On May 12, 1963, Edwards asked members of his congregation to raise their hands if they had done so, but only three did. In a striking demonstration of moral leadership, the frustrated Edwards refused to preach and simply gave the benediction and left. He later posed the profound question: "If Christian people do not express themselves in a time like this then who will?"[50]

---

[48] "Church Integration: Minister Talks of Application," *News and Observer*, 22 April 1963, 22.
[49] Fergurson, *Hard Right*, 227.
[50] "Negroes Crowd Churches Sunday: Turned Away From Calvary Baptist," *News and Observer*, 13 May 1963, 20; "Presbyterian Minister Explains His Actions," *News and Observer*, 13 May 1963, 20.

Later that week, the congregation of First Presbyterian gave Edwards a continued vote of confidence to continue in his position. The confidence vote demonstrated that there were likely many members of the church who were in favor of integration. But the fact that only three members had sent letters to segregated businesses was symbolic of the lack of leadership most white people in the city took in pushing for integration. However, Edwards's refusal to preach was an indicator of the impact that the student-led protest movement was having on some individuals in the city. It is highly unlikely that Edwards would have taken such a principled stand if the sit-ins and protest marches were not gripping the city.[51] The student-led movement mobilized sympathetic figures to take a stronger stand for integration. Perhaps more importantly, the movement pressured tentative leaders to make a decision about whether to support integration or defend segregation. By late spring 1963, the direct-action movement in the city made it increasingly clear that the tentative approach that so many politicians and business leaders had taken was increasingly untenable.

The direct-action movement increasingly forced whites in Raleigh to take a stance on the issue of African American civil rights. A May 14, 1963 editorial in *The News and Observer* titled "No Bystanders Now" pointed out that "hardly any human being in Raleigh at this moment can be an uncommitted bystander in the situation which confronts the community."[52] By mid-May 1963, over 160 protestors had been arrested, mostly for trespassing, nearly all of them students from Shaw University and Saint Augustine's College. On May 13, the Raleigh Merchants Bureau called for "the removal of all

[51] "Confidence," *News and Observer*, 16 May 1963, 36.
[52] "No Bystanders Now," *News and Observer*, 14 May 1963, 4.

policies in both government and business which deny rights and services because of race," the most significant example of leadership to date demonstrated by a business group in the city.[53] For the following week, activists avoided staging demonstrations in order for the mayor's bi-racial committee to work toward a solution. But demonstrations continued on May 21, as activists remained dissatisfied with the pace of progress. Like other southern cities, in Raleigh sit-ins and other protests were often followed by a temporary cessation in protests, only to resume after biracial committees or political and business groups failed to offer a viable solution.[54]

Among the most important groups in pushing for integration in Raleigh was the Citizens Coordinating Committee, a group of African Americans who sought to "dispel any notion that we either recognize or accept the fiction that the Negro citizen has a place separate from or less than that of other American citizens." In a May 10, 1963 meeting, the group asserted that demonstrations would continue in Raleigh until complete segregation occurred in downtown theaters, hotels, motels, and restaurants and in businesses in Cameron Village. The group also called for an end to employment discrimination, a plan for further desegregation of Raleigh's public schools, and for the city council to create an ordinance that would prohibit licensed businesses from discriminating against any person based on race, creed, or color.[55]

The Citizens Coordinating Committee attempted to funnel the power of the student-led demonstrations, and the group did not trivialize the importance of the student

---

[53] Bob Lynch and Tom Inman, "Committee Named: Merchants Here Urge End to Segregation," *News and Observer*, 14 May 1963, 1, 2.
[54] "Negroes March Again in Downtown Raleigh," *News and Observer*, 21 May 1963, 21.
[55] "Declaration of Principles and Intentions of the Citizens Coordinating Committee," 11 May 1963, Series 2, Box 32, Folder 1130, Lowenstein Papers, Southern Historical Collection.

leadership. In the opening line of its "Declaration of Principles and Intentions," the group declared itself as being constituted of "public minded citizens who represent the Negro Community of Raleigh, including the student bodies of Shaw University and Saint Augustine's College."[56] Mack Sowell was among the nine signatories, as was Saint Augustine's College student and Vice-President of the college's Youth Chapter of the NAACP, Raymond Cauthorn. Charles Earle also became heavily involved in the committee's activities. Other signatories included Shaw University math professor Virginia Newell and Saint Augustine's College Dean, Dr. Prezell Robinson. Dr. Charles Lyons was the Chairman of the group. The group also included a critically important figure in the lives of many Shaw students, the Dean of the school's Divinity School and president of the Raleigh Citizens Association, Dr. Grady D. Davis. Another prominent member was the father of the first African American child in Raleigh to attend a previously all-white school, the president of the Raleigh NAACP, Ralph Campbell, Sr.[57]

On June 5, 1963, Raleigh's bi-racial committee announced that seventy-six business establishments either had or would adopt non-discriminatory policies. However, the group did not specify which establishments were doing so. Perhaps most tellingly, Mayor Enloe did not say if the Ambassador Theater would be among those that were integrating, which was typical of his tentative leadership on the issue of integration. Student leaders from Shaw University and Saint Augustine's College recognized that, with the help of sympathetic citizens in Raleigh and the Citizens Coordinating Committee, they would have to continue to counter the tentative city business and

[56] Ibid.
[57] Ibid.

political leaders. On June 12, the same day that protests outside the Sir Walter Hotel attracted nearly five hundred white and black onlookers, Lyons and the Citizens Coordinating Committee issued a statement claiming that "the biracial committee has been strangely silent since issuing its 'famous' statement that 76 businesses either have integrated or are integrating their facilities. Citizens still want to know—and rightly so—the identity of these businesses." The committee also said it was "likewise disappointed at the strange and loud silence of the office of the mayor."[58]

Mayor Enloe's tentative dance on the issue of integration was being challenged by students from Shaw University and Saint Augustine's College and others in Raleigh. In my survey, which asked respondents to rate individuals on a scale of 1-10 based on their contributions to improving conditions for African Americans in the city, the average response was a mere 2.5 for Enloe. As previously mentioned, protestors viewed Enloe as a "symbol" rather than a "target" for the protests. And Enloe was symbolic of the type of North Carolina politician who sought to find a way to end the demonstrations but either cared not or dared not to take a strong stance in favor of integration.[59]

Meanwhile, students from Shaw University and Saint Augustine's College were taking a strong stand against segregation and demonstrating a clear sense of leadership that most students viewed as part of their education.[60] For many of the student leaders, their actions during the demonstrations came at a seminal period in their life that would establish a precedent for leadership opportunities later in life. Many of those

---

[58] Jonathan Friendly, "76 Business Firms Here Integrating," *News and Observer*, 5 June 1963, 1, 3; "Negro 'Sit-In' Group at Hotel Draws Crowd of 500 Spectators," *News and Observer*, 13 June 1963, 38.
[59] "Enloe 'Symbol,' Not Target of Protests," *News and Observer*, 11 April 1963, 31. See appendix for survey results.
[60] See Survey (Students) in appendix.

opportunities would not have become available if not for the mass movement against segregation in the early 1960s. An editorial by University of Florida professor Kimbal Wiles appeared as accurate in 1963 as it did in 1960 when he wrote the editorial during the first wave of the sit-in movement. Wiles pointed out that the sit-ins were demonstrating that African Americans were "developing skill in taking political and social action. Negro youths are moving into leadership roles. On the other hand, white youths are kept in the background. Action to preserve segregation is in the hands of older people, who are watched, sometimes cynically, by the young."[61] The actions of the protestors were undoubtedly part of a broader challenge to the moral concerns posed by segregation. But the actions of student demonstrators also had a tangible impact on the lives of the protestors. By challenging segregation, they were part of the process of opening up societal opportunities, including leadership roles, which had previously been denied to African Americans. Civil rights activism was the ultimate course in leadership, one that extended well beyond the classroom.

Civil rights activism in Durham in the early 1960s shared many similarities with Raleigh, but there were also features that made Durham unique. For one, Durham had an individual that stood out as the most significant civil rights leader in the city. By 1963, Floyd McKissick had become not only a highly-respected leader in the city, but was also earning a nationwide reputation. Raleigh certainly had respected activists such as Grady Davis and Ralph Campbell, Sr., and student leaders such as Charles Earle and Mack Sowell, but none had the type of name recognition of McKissick. By 1963, McKissick

[61] Kimbal Wiles (editorial), "The High Calling of Non-Violent Protests," *Carolina Times*, 7 May 1960, 2.

already had extensive experience in challenging segregation. After serving in World War II, McKissick participated in the 1947 Journey of Reconciliation, a predecessor to the more widely known Freedom Rides of the early 1960s. After initially being denied due to his race, McKissick became the first African American to attend the University of North Carolina Law School after a successful appeal led by the NAACP. Like Elwyna and Joseph Holt, and June and Ralph Campbell, McKissick and his wife Evelyn made the courageous and fateful decision to attempt to enroll their children in previously all-white schools. Joycelyn McKissick became the first African American female to graduate from Durham High School in 1960.[62]

By 1963, Floyd McKissick was a critical figure in the civil rights movement in Durham. While most protestors remained nonviolent, McKissick was forced to pull protestors with weapons off the picket lines. He represented CORE at the meeting with President John F. Kennedy on the day of the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom, filling in for the incarcerated CORE national director, James Farmer. There is little doubt that McKissick was a towering figure in the movement in Durham, but that should not obscure the reality that he relied heavily on college and high school students in Durham in his efforts to push for integration. Likewise, in moments of crisis, the students relied on McKissick for guidance and legal advice. He had reinvigorated NAACP youth chapters in Durham in the late 1950s, and his support of student activism in the early 1960s in Durham and throughout the state had a major impact on the student

[62] Christina Greene, *Our Separate Ways: Women and the Black Freedom Movement in Durham, North Carolina* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 25, 42; Denique Prout, "Symposium Honors Women," *Campus Echo Online*, 22 April 2009, Vol 100, Issue 11, available online at https://web.nccu.edu/campus/echo/c-symposium.html

movement.[63] Although McKissick had developed connections in high places in the civil rights movement by 1963, he continued to recognize the power of students and other young people to carry the movement forward.

Student activists from NCC played a major role in the demonstrations. Guytana Horton and Quinton Baker were among the most significant student activists, playing crucial roles in the protests in 1963. Horton was a junior at NCC in 1963, and was the president of the state NAACP intercollegiate division. In 1962, she and Joycelyn McKissick had been arrested for requesting service at a Durham Howard Johnson's restaurant, which had been a target of CORE and NAACP demonstrations during the Freedom Highways Project. Both women refused to pay their trespass fines, and were ordered to work as maids for elderly patients at the county work home. The Freedom Highways Project was successful in bringing about the desegregation of about half of the Howard Johnson's restaurants in North Carolina. But the Durham Howard Johnson's remained segregated and became a primary target for demonstrations in 1963.[64]

Mid-May 1963 was a historic period in Durham, as massive demonstrations gripped the city, and the city also elected a new mayor. The demonstrations were similar to those in several cities throughout North Carolina and throughout the South in May. To a large extent, the rise in demonstrations was a response to civil rights campaigns taking place in Birmingham, Alabama. The Southern Christian Leadership Conference undertook a major program to further mobilize citizens to confront segregation in the city

---

[63] August Meier and Elliott Rudwick, *CORE: A Study in the Civil Rights Movement* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), 172; Christina Greene, *Our Separate Ways*, 96.
[64] Greene, *Our Separate Ways*, 86, 87.

that Martin Luther King, Jr. called the "belly of the beast."[65] Project "C" (for Confrontation) directly challenged segregated practices in the city and took the controversial step of utilizing young students in the protests in early May. The demonstrations in Birmingham also effectively utilized the power of media to expose the darkest aspects of a segregated society. Commissioner of Public Safety Eugene "Bull" Connor's response to the demonstrations provided enduring images to the rest of the country and the world. The utilization of fire hoses and police dogs as methods to control protests were perhaps the most iconic images of the response to civil rights protests in the United States.[66]

The presence of Martin Luther King, Jr. and other prominent SCLC activists such as Ralph Abernathy, Andrew Young, and James Bevel clearly brought excitement to local protestors and dramatically increased media coverage in Birmingham. But Project "C" was far from the beginning of civil rights activity in Birmingham. In response to the state of Alabama banning the NAACP, Birmingham's Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth took the lead in creating the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights in 1956. He was also a seminal figure in SCLC. Much like Ralph and June Campbell in Raleigh, and Floyd and Evelyn McKissick in Durham, Shuttlesworth risked the ultimate sacrifice in the push for integration by attempting to enroll his children in all-white schools. His efforts resulted in a severe beating by segregationists in 1957. At the hospital, the doctor

---

[65] Jerry Sutton, *A Matter of Conviction: A History of Southern Baptist Engagement with the Culture* (Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 2008), 167.
[66] Diane McWhorter, *Carry Me Home: Birmingham, Alabama: The Climatic Battle of the Civil Rights Revolution* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2001), 308.

told Shuttlesworth that he must have a hard head, to which Shuttlesworth replied, "Doctor, the Lord knew I was in a hard town so He gave me a hard head."[67]

Shuttlesworth and SCLC field secretary James Bevel were among the advocates of encouraging high school students to participate in demonstrations. One advantage to utilizing students was their relative immunity to economic reprisals, although those with parents who worked for white employers certainly put their parents' jobs at risk and exposed them to possible prosecution for contributing to the delinquency of minors. United Press International termed King the "mastermind" of the strategy, but King was deeply concerned that the strategy could backfire. It took tremendous courage for the SCLC leadership to embrace the strategy of utilizing children. But the bold approach of the SCLC leaders should not overshadow the courage that hundreds of parents displayed by allowing their children to participate, or in other cases, the courage displayed by the children to disobey their parents and school administrators and protest against their wishes. There is no question that King played a crucial role in the Birmingham campaign in the spring of 1963. But the protestors themselves carried the movement and also helped to shape King's approach. As historian Thomas F. Jackson cogently argues, "The mass marchers made up the mastermind's mind."[68]

The efforts of King and the SCLC leadership, in addition to the actions of activists in Birmingham, were an inspiration to activists throughout the nation. They provided a further spark to a movement in Durham that had already achieved many

---

[67] McWhorter, *Carry Me Home*, 127-128.
[68] Thomas F. Jackson, *From Civil Rights to Human Rights: Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Struggle for Economic Justice* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 160.

victories in the previous three years but that recognized there was much work left undone. On May 18, activists in Durham staged a plethora of demonstrations, including sit-ins at a variety of locations. Police arrested 130 protestors for trespassing at Holiday Inn, S&W Cafeteria, Harvey's Cafeteria, University Grill, Palms Restaurant, and Oriental Restaurant. A typical scene occurred at the Oriental Restaurant. A protest leader spoke with a manager, and the leader told the other protestors that they would not be served, and were free to leave or stay and wait for the police to come. Hundreds of protestors cheered for the arrested demonstrators in front of the county courthouse as they were led to jail.[69]

The most significant mass demonstration in Durham occurred on Sunday, May 19, 1963. At Saint Joseph's A.M.E. Church, activists listened to speeches by James Farmer, national director of CORE, and by Roy Wilkins, the national director of the NAACP. Later that day, protestors crowded around the Howard Johnson's restaurant on the Durham-Chapel Hill Boulevard. Nearly five hundred protestors, mostly high school students and NCC students, marched around the restaurant singing, "We're going to eat at Howard Johnson's one of these days." John Brooks, the national director of the NAACP voting drive, and Melvin Swann, the pastor at Saint Joseph's A.M.E. Church, entered the restaurant and were arrested for trespassing. The demonstrators proceeded to sit down in the parking lot of the restaurant, and some crowded around parked cars. They refused to leave even after police threatened to utilize tear gas. Ultimately, over four

[69] Howard Jones, "130 Arrested As Negroes Stage Sit-In Protest Here," *Durham Morning Herald*, 19 May 1963, 1.

hundred demonstrators were arrested and taken by five Trailways buses to the county jail, where they continued singing freedom songs.[70]

The events of May 19, 1963 were representative of so many of the characteristics of the movement in Durham. First and foremost, NCC students and high school students provided the backbone of the movement, but they received significant support from various people in the community and civil rights leaders who did not live in Durham. The NAACP-CORE efforts in Durham were among the most significant campaigns supported by the two civil rights organizations in 1962 and 1963. The event also displayed the willingness of local African American preachers to lead by example, evidenced in Melvin Swann's willingness to face arrest.[71]

Among the most important local leaders were students from North Carolina College, including Quinton Baker, the president of the college chapter of the NAACP. Even as a junior in college, Baker was a veteran civil rights activist who had participated in sit-ins and other forms of protest since 1960. Baker carried on the tradition of protest that had been enhanced by student leaders like Lacy Streeter. Baker knew Streeter (and was friends with Streeter's brother) from their adolescent years in Greenville, North Carolina.[72] Baker's leadership was on full display in the parking lot at Howard Johnson's as he urged fellow protestors to remain despite the threats of tear gas (which police ultimately did not use). As a crowd of nearly three hundred white onlookers

---

[70] Howard Jones, "400 Negroes Are Arrested As Protests Continue Here: Police Break Up Scuffles," *Durham Morning Herald*, 20 May 1963, 1.
[71] Meier and Rudwick, *CORE*, 170-172.
[72] Quinton E. Baker, interview by Chris McGinnis, 23 February 2002, Documenting the American South, Southern Oral History Program Collection #4007, Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

watched the demonstration develop, Baker, who was gay, told the white crowd, "Look out, all you people who feel I'm an animal, because I am going to prove that I am a man."[73] Baker and the protestors in general attacked the social traditions that had treated them at best as second class citizens and at worst as less than human.

On May 20, 1963, Baker and Walter Riley were among the student leaders who gave a petition to the Durham City Council asking for fair employment for African Americans in city jobs and for a law requiring businesses licensed by the public to serve customers without regard to race. Riley, a graduate of Hillside High School, was the president of the Durham chapter of the NAACP, despite being only nineteen years old in 1963. He had recently married Candida Lall, a white woman from Oakland, California, whom he had met while working with the Freedom Highways Project. They had to get married in Washington, D.C., as interracial marriage in North Carolina was prohibited until the U.S. Supreme Court effectively struck down anti-miscegenation laws in *Loving v. Virginia* in 1967. By 1963, Riley and Baker were two of the most important leaders in the fight for integration in Durham. They sought to counter the city and state leadership that had failed to take a strong stance in favor of equal opportunities for African Americans.[74]

The targeting of Howard Johnson's in Durham had added significance due to the fact that one of North Carolina's U.S. Senators, B. Everett Jordan, was part owner of the Durham restaurant. Much as was the case with Mayor W.G. Enloe in Raleigh, Jordan

---

[73] Howard Jones, "400 Negroes Are Arrested As Protests Continue Here: Police Break Up Scuffles," *Durham Morning Herald*, 20 May 1963, 1.
[74] Jon Phelps, "Grabarek, Negro Leaders Parley," *Durham Morning Herald*, 21 May 1963, 1B; Walter Riley, interview by the author.

showed no tendency to take a leadership role in pushing for integration of the business over which he had some influence. Jordan was in a position to exert influence on the manager of the store to integrate, but he did not do so. But the manager of the store, Harold Makepeace, began to receive pressure from the president of the restaurant chain, Howard B. Johnson himself. In late May, Johnson wrote a letter to Makepeace stating that it was a "source of embarrassment in that members of the public confuse your position with that of the company."[75] Like many other restaurant, theater, and hotel owners in the city and throughout the state, Makepeace did not want to integrate unless all of the business establishments agreed to do so. He would not take a stand for integration unless pressured. For businessmen and politicians like Makepeace, Mayor Enloe, and Senator Jordan, their feet seemed to be stuck in a past that tolerated racial discrimination. This was Tar Heel hospitality at its worst.

But by May 1963, civil rights activists in Durham had a new ally in the form of recently elected Mayor R. Wensell "Wense" Grabarek. Unlike in Raleigh where the city council voted for the mayor, the mayor of Durham was elected by popular vote. During his campaign, Grabarek did not speak tentatively and ambiguously on the issue of race relations as so many North Carolina politicians had in the early 1960s. In the week prior to the election, he explicitly stated that "unity of purpose is the first thing we need. Treat each of us exactly alike, we're all equal." As a Pennsylvania native, Grabarek had not been raised in a segregated society. He was popular among African Americans in Durham, and his margin of victory was roughly equivalent to the number of voters in

[75] New York AP, "Reprimand For Durham Restaurant," *News and Observer*, 1 June 1963, 1.

predominantly black districts. In the Hillside High School district, Grabarek outpaced his opponent Watts Carr, Jr. 853 to 88.[76] His election not only demonstrated the power of the African American vote, but also showed that many white voters in Durham were willing to support a candidate who did not appeal to racial discrimination.

Grabarek took office at the peak of civil rights demonstrations in Durham. The aforementioned protests at Howard Johnson's and other segregated businesses in the city led to overcrowded jails. NCC student Vannie Culmer recalled that over one hundred people were placed in a jail cell designed for about a dozen people. The cell was hot and crowded, and the jailer told the group that he would close the window if they continued singing. But his threat did not deter the protestors, as they fittingly sang "No more Mr. Charley" and continued on with their freedom songs. Fellow NCC student Fay Bryant (Mayo) recalled the excitement and the singing of the freedom songs but also the hunger that beset the protestors while in jail. The sandwiches that arrived from campus were a welcome sight.[77]

Grabarek's first few days as mayor of Durham only made it clearer that the city faced a committed movement that would not be deterred by arrests or other methods of control. Unlike most other political leaders in North Carolina and throughout the South, Grabarek did not criticize the means that protestors utilized to achieve integration in public accommodations. On May 21, he addressed a mass rally of mostly African

---

[76] "Carr, Grabarek Give Programs: Railroad Industry 'Fair Deal,'" *Durham Sun*, 10 May 1963, 5A; Charles Barbour, "Grabarek Elected Mayor of Durham: Three Incumbents Among 6 Council Members Chosen," *Durham Morning Herald*, 19 May 1963, 1; "How Durham Voted in Saturday's Municipal Elections," *Durham Morning Herald*, 19 May 1961, 1.

[77] Vannie C. Culmer, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 26 January 2017; Fay Bryant Mayo, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 1 February 2017. "Mr. Charley" was a slang term that essentially referred to an overbearing white man.

Americans held at Saint Joseph's Church and vowed to oppose segregation in exchange for a cessation of the protests. He termed the civil rights demonstrations as "valuable tools" for getting whites to understand the "seriousness and sincerity" of the protestors.[78] Civil rights activists pressured Grabarek to take a strong stand in favor of integration from an early point in his time as mayor, and for the most part, he responded favorably. In his first week as mayor, the Durham youth and college chapters of the NAACP and CORE thanked Grabarek for his efforts.[79] The mayor established the eleven-man biracial Durham Interim Committee to help negotiate further desegregation of businesses in the city. By June 4, 1963, all eleven of the city's motels, its leading hotel, and 55 of the 103 eating establishments had integrated. Just two weeks later, 90 percent of the eating establishments in the city had been integrated.[80]

Grabarek undoubtedly played an important role in bringing about further integration in Durham, but his role should not be overstated. Walter Riley maintains that "Grabarek would like to be known as the one who brought integration to Durham. But it is not true."[81] The reality is that civil rights demonstrators had forcefully pushed for integration through the use of mass protests. They put city political and business leaders in a position in which they could no longer take a tentative approach to the issue of segregation. "Moderate" politicians who attempted to walk the fine line between appeasing segregationists and opponents of segregation had been put in an untenable

---

[78] "Interim Committee Set To Meet Today," *Durham Sun*, 24 May 1963, 5A.
[79] Pat Carter, "Grabarek Given Thanks, Warning By Negro Groups," 23 May 1963, 1.
[80] Paul Fogleman, "More Racial Bars Fall in Durham: Sleeping, Many Eating Facilities Now Integrated," *Durham Morning Herald*, 5 June 1963, 1; Jon Phelps, "90 Pct. Of Durham Eating Facilities Now Desegregated," *Durham Morning Herald*, 19 June 1963, 1.
[81] Walter Riley, phone interview by the author.

position by activists in Durham in the late spring and early summer of 1963. Sit-ins, pickets, and boycotts had also put business leaders in a position in which they had to make decisions on whether to integrate, and no logical businessperson could assume that the protests would fade away. Grabarek should ultimately be remembered for posterity as a man who came to the mayor's office in a historic moment in the city, and he was up to the challenge of providing leadership for integration in an era in which many state political leaders equivocated. But it was the civil rights activists, especially those from NCC and Hillside High School, supported and encouraged by national and local veteran activists such as James Farmer and Floyd McKissick, who had provided the impetus for such a historic moment.

In both Raleigh and Durham, activists from the "Protest Triangle" had countered the forces of segregation in the two cities. By late spring 1963, there was increasing pressure on Governor Terry Sanford to take a stronger stand in favor of integration, especially evident in the aforementioned march on the Governor's Mansion in Raleigh on May 11. After a protestor shouted that Sanford "should have known our troubles," Sanford replied, "I'm not a dictator, son. You're in a democracy."[82] Sanford's response was emblematic of his approach to the demonstrators. He was civil and outwardly respectful to them but opposed their means of pushing for change. He also implied that there was little he could do in the way of forcing integration. While it might have been wishful thinking to expect Sanford to issue any sort of executive order calling for desegregation in state-licensed businesses, Kentucky Governor Bert Combs did just that

[82] Bob Lynch and Roy Parker, Jr., "Negroes Boo Gov. At Mansion," *News and Observer*, 11 May 1963, 1.

in late June 1963. Combs ordered all discrimination to end in businesses licensed by the state.[83]

Sanford took a more cautious approach. Although he was opposed to issuing an executive order, by the summer of 1963 he faced increased pressure to push for integration. As protests continued in several North Carolina cities and towns in mid-June, Sanford appealed for an end to demonstrations and called for a meeting with African American leaders on June 25. Fayetteville Mayor Wilbur Clark, whose city had seen massive demonstrations largely led by students from the historically black Fayetteville State College, claimed that Sanford's call was "the kind of talk we need from people in high places."[84]

The governor's approach at the meeting at the old house chamber was classic Sanford. He exhibited some concern for the goals of the protestors and African American leaders. He acknowledged that "the demonstrations have shown just how unhappy and discontent[ed] you are, how anxious you are to remove, and remove right now, the indignities and injustices which have been visited upon your parents and their parents. The demonstrations brought the message, and the message, in its truth and fullness, stirred action which brought your progress."[85] Thus, he recognized the impact that the demonstrations had already made in producing changes in various places throughout the state. He ostensibly acknowledged that the protest leaders were no longer

---

[83] Frankfort, Kentucky AP, "Sweeping Order By Governor: Kentucky Ends Discrimination," *News and Observer*, 27 June 1963, 1.
[84] Roy Parker, Jr., "Calls Negro Leaders to Conference: End Marches—Sanford," *News and Observer*, 19 June 1963, 1.
[85] Roy Parker, Jr., "Negro Leaders Reject Plea By Sanford: Plan Protests," *News and Observer*, 26 June 1963, 1.

willing to wait for further changes in terms of desegregation and improvements in job opportunities. In this sense, Sanford was much more progressive than most other southern politicians. However, Sanford's actions at the meeting also demonstrated the tentative dance that often plagued his leadership, or in many cases lack thereof, on the issue. For instance, Sanford left the June 25 meeting after his short speech, and thus, did not remain to hear the comments made by civil rights leaders. This arrangement was apparently worked out with Floyd McKissick, and Sanford believed it to be a time for venting among the civil rights leaders. To avoid the session from spiraling into verbal attacks on the governor's office, Sanford arranged for his most trusted race relations troubleshooter Capus Waynick, and Good Neighbor Council chairman David S. Coltrane, to remain at the meeting.[86] At this historic meeting, Sanford could have demonstrated leadership by listening to the impressive array of civil rights leaders at the meeting and facing their concerns head on. Waynick and Coltrane were trusted surrogates, but Sanford's arrangement to leave the meeting did not exactly demonstrate strong leadership.

The impressive group of civil rights leaders at the meeting included Floyd McKissick, state NAACP president Kelly Alexander, and Golden Frinks, the SCLC leader who had led several demonstrations in Williamston. The group also included student protest leaders, including North Carolina A&T's Jesse Jackson, who played a critical role in the demonstrations in Greensboro. As a whole, the leaders were not content with Sanford's call for an end to demonstrations. National NAACP official John

[86] Howard E. Covington, Jr. and Marion A. Ellis, *Terry Sanford: Politics, Progress, and Outrageous Ambitions* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1999), 320.

Brooks called Sanford's speech "brainwashing," and he urged those in attendance to "go home and plan bigger and better demonstrations." Floyd McKissick told the group, "We fear the governor misunderstands the situation. It is utterly necessary that the people see the point of the demonstrations, not just the governor. And every indication is that the majority of the white people in North Carolina have not begun to grasp the point of the demonstrations."[87]

After the meeting, McKissick's daughter Joycelyn asked Waynick to join her for lunch at the Sir Walter Hotel. He declined and told her he was afraid the management might tell him something to the effect of: "Why, we'll have to feed this Negro, but you white so-and-so get the hell out of here."[88] Waynick ultimately should be remembered overall for his efforts to bring about positive changes in race relations and for improving opportunities for African Americans in North Carolina. But his circular logic in response to Joycelyn McKissick's invitation was confounding. Waynick believed that improving race relations required changes in attitudes, not just changes in laws.[89] He and other important figures such as Sanford were in the perfect position to take a leadership role in challenging attitudes. He was perfectly willing to sit down with African American leaders to discuss their concerns. But to sit with an African American at a table or lunch counter at a segregated restaurant was a different story. The racist underpinnings of Tar Heel hospitality and Tar Heel politics remained intertwined in the summer of 1963, but the challenges to both were getting stronger.

---

[87] Covington, Jr. and Ellis, *Terry Sanford*, 321, 322.
[88] Ibid., 322.
[89] Ibid.

Ultimately, the civil rights leaders at the June 25 meeting rejected Sanford's plea to end demonstrations. They recognized the importance of keeping the pressure on business and political leaders to enact change. In a 2016 interview, Walter Riley recalled that "anything that came from Sanford [in the way of race relations] was forced. It was not led."[90] Great progress had already been made by the summer of 1963, and civil rights activists realized the significant role that the protests played in bringing about change. Sanford had already proven that he was not a diehard defender of segregation like many southern governors. But by the summer of 1963, he was in a position in which he could have taken a strong stand against segregation, even if it was politically unpopular.

At a July 5 meeting, approximately two hundred mayors unanimously adopted a resolution commending Sanford's leadership in the racial crisis in the state. He indeed had demonstrated some leadership in encouraging desegregation. He called on the mayors of North Carolina's cities to set an example for the rest of the nation in dealing with the racial crisis. He asserted that the only way to solve the problem was by "removing the injustices and indignities long suffered by the Negro race." But the governor also revealed his reluctance to take strong action against segregation by refusing to issue an executive order banning segregation. At the meeting, Greensboro city councilman Forrest Campbell asked the governor if he planned on following the lead of Governor Bert Combs of Kentucky in issuing such an order. Sanford responded that such an approach "is not viewed as a solution to the problem."[91]

---

[90] Roy Parker, Jr., "Negro Leaders Reject Plea By Sanford: Plan Protests," *News and Observer*, 26 June 1963, 1; Walter Riley, interview by the author.

[91] Greensboro AP, "Sanford Asks Mayors For Racial Crisis Aid: Calls Towns and Cities To Set Example," *News and Observer*, 6 July 1963, 1.

Sanford's approach was to appeal to business leaders to voluntarily desegregate. In this sense, he was much more of an ally to civil rights activists than nearly all other southern governors, and certainly more of an ally than I. Beverly Lake would have been if he had defeated Sanford in the 1960 gubernatorial election. In this limited sense, he lived up to his promise of a "new day" in North Carolina that he declared in his inauguration speech.[92] But his refusal to issue an executive order similar to that of Kentucky's governor or to attempt to assert his political authority in favor of desegregation revealed the tentative dance that characterized Sanford's approach to race relations. In some respects, Sanford had one foot inching toward a "new day" in race relations in the state, and for the most part, he was bolder than most state political leaders in encouraging desegregation. But the activists pushing for immediate changes in social and economic opportunities of African Americans could not ignore the reality that the governor seemed to have one foot in the past that tolerated the customs of a segregationist vision of Tar Heel hospitality.

Perhaps the most troubling aspect of Sanford's cautious leadership regarding desegregation and the social and economic opportunities for African Americans was his failure to fully comprehend the connection between education and civil rights activism among students from historically black colleges. He seemingly failed to recognize that many black students viewed their participation in civil rights demonstrations as part of their education. Although by 1963, he appeared to sympathize with the general goals of the demonstrators, he repeatedly demeaned the protests. At the July 5 meeting with the

---

[92] Memory F. Mitchell, ed., *Messages, Addresses, and Public Paper of Terry Sanford, Governor of North Carolina, 1961-1965* (Raleigh: Council of State, State of North Carolina, 1966), 3.

mayors of several cities, Sanford declared: "So long as I am governor, the state is not going to take its cue from the fear of masses or mobs."[93] The governor's bluster betrayed the reality that nearly every demonstration had been peaceful. More significantly, by implying that the demonstrators were actually mobs that inspired fear, he obscured the reality that most of the protestors were well-dressed, educated people that had similar goals for which Sanford ostensibly stood: quality education and the improved opportunities that resulted.

There is no doubt that Sanford lived up to his campaign promises to improve public education. In his inaugural address in 1961, Sanford declared that "we are on the move because we have put our fundamental faith in universal education."[94] Sanford pushed for major increases in teacher pay to make the state more competitive in obtaining and retaining quality teachers. In his first year as governor in 1961, teacher pay (including bonuses) at public schools was raised approximately 17 percent. By 1963, Sanford had pushed forward plans to dramatically improve higher education in the state, which helped secure legislative approval for a system of community colleges and the establishment of four-year colleges in Charlotte, Wilmington, and Asheville that had previously operated as two-year colleges. Winfred Godwin, the director of The Southern Regional Education Board termed North Carolina a "pace-setter" and maintained that the state's major breakthrough in higher education "is based on the creed that educational opportunity and educational equality must advance hand in hand—that they are

---

[93] Greensboro AP, "Sanford Asks Mayors For Racial Crisis Aid: Calls Towns and Cities To Set Example," *News and Observer*, 6 July 1963, 1.
[94] Mitchell, ed., *Messages, Addresses, and Public Papers of Terry Sanford*, 5.

inseparable, not inconsistent, but mutually dependent."[95] Sanford had led the push for better public education in the state. In doing so, he opened up further economic opportunities for many of the state's citizens. Meanwhile, African Americans throughout the state experienced limits in their opportunities, even for those that were highly educated. The pressure that activists, especially those from historically black colleges, continued to exert on Sanford and the state leadership was an indicator that they believed that their social and economic opportunities were not equivalent to what those opportunities should have been, given their level of education.

Although there were instances in which Sanford took a cautious approach to desegregation of public accommodations and to assisting with economic opportunities for African Americans, he nonetheless demonstrated some willingness to push for further cooperation among races and for improving conditions for African Americans in the state. On January 18, 1963, he called for the establishment of the North Carolina Good Neighbor Council. According to the Council's first chairman, David S. Coltrane, the twenty-four member council had a two-fold mission: "1) to encourage the employment of qualified people without regard to race, and 2) to encourage youth to become better trained and qualified for employment."[96] In a speech to the North Carolina Press Institute, Sanford asked all mayors to establish local good neighbor councils. He also revealed that his administration had issued memoranda to heads of state agencies and institutions to end discriminatory hiring practices if they had not already done so. Thus,

---

[95] Winfred Godwin, "North Carolina Pace-Setter For Southern Education," *News and Observer*, 30 June 1963, 4.
[96] Capus M. Waynick, John C. Brooks, Elsie W. Pitts, eds., *North Carolina and the Negro* (Raleigh: Mayors Cooperating Committee, 1964), 255.

Sanford pushed for the end of official state discrimination in hiring practices. In his speech he argued that "the time has come for American citizens to quit unfair discriminations and to give the Negro a full chance to earn a decent living for his family and to contribute to higher standards for himself and all men."[97] The following excerpt from the January speech was classic Sanford, in which he made a moral and economic appeal for the end of discriminatory practices, but qualified it with the reality that he would not utilize his power to actively force such changes:

> We can do this, we should do this, we will do it because we are concerned with the problems and welfare of our neighbors. We will do it because our economy cannot afford to have so many people fully or partially unproductive. We will do it because it is honest and fair for us to give all men and women their best chance in life. We are just going to have to open up jobs for all people on the basis of ability and training, and promotions on the basis of performance. I do not intend to try to force anybody. I do not believe in force. In fact, this is a voluntary, low-pressure program. I do believe the conscience of North Carolinians will get the job done.[98]

Sanford certainly deserves credit for helping to bring about increased opportunities for African Americans in state jobs. He also displayed a level of encouragement for desegregation that was rare among southern politicians. Yet, he fell short of being a true ally to activists who sought immediate changes to the policies of discrimination that had plagued private business in the state for so long. His contention that the Good Neighbor Council program was a "voluntary, low-pressure program" was emblematic of his cautious approach. There were some potential advantages to this approach from a political standpoint, as any effort by the governor to force integration

---

[97] Waynick, Brooks, and Pitts, eds., *North Carolina and the Negro*, 256.
[98] Ibid.

would have been met with a backlash from conservative state legislators and local politicians. William Chafe points out that Sanford's strategy depended upon the voluntary cooperation of local leaders in order to be effective. He argues that "although Sanford's leadership proved more enlightened and more imaginative than that of any other Southern governor, his strategy for change foundered on its own premise of voluntarism."[99]

Civil rights activists in the Triangle and throughout the state recognized that while Sanford might have applied some rhetorical pressure to business and government leaders to end discriminatory practices, it was indeed a "low-pressure" approach. Therefore, pressure would need to be applied by activists themselves in order to bring about major changes. By the spring and summer of 1963, protestors had created a scenario in which local good neighbor councils or other biracial committees were forced into becoming more effective and taking a stronger stand toward integration. The statewide Good Neighbor Council that had been established in January did not hold its first formal meeting until July 3, 1963, which came after extensive desegregation in restaurants, theaters, hotels and motels had already occurred in Raleigh and Durham. Even though the North Carolina Good Neighbor Council had been established prior to the mass demonstrations of the spring and summer of 1963 in many North Carolina cities, the Council's efforts were more of a response to protest demonstrations throughout the state, rather than vice versa.[100]

---

[99] William Chafe, *Civilities and Civil Rights: Greensboro, North Carolina and the Black Struggle for Freedom* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), 150.
[100] AP, "Racial Outlook Uncertain in State," *News and Observer*, 30 June 1963, 11; Roy Parker, Jr., "Gov. Pledges No Barriers to State Jobs," *News and Observer*, 4 July 1963, 1.

Civil rights activists in Raleigh and Durham realized that they needed to apply pressure to local and state political and business leaders to bring about changes in discriminatory serving and hiring practices. In 1963, they challenged the traditional customs that preserved a segregated vision of Tar Heel hospitality. That year did not represent the advent of civil rights activism utilizing direct-action tactics in the two cities, but rather, its zenith. Student activists from the "Protest Triangle" had several dedicated allies, including students and faculty from the Research Triangle schools, as well as committed citizens in the community. Together they countered the forces of segregation. But they also challenged their reluctant allies like Terry Sanford and certain business leaders to take a stronger stand in favor of desegregating public accommodations and opening job opportunities. As similar movements in other cities grew, the impetus for national change became overwhelming. In the spring and summer of 1963, activists like Mack Sowell had not only witnessed some of the changes in segregated practices in Raleigh, but he had also been an active participant in bringing them about through his leadership of demonstrations and in mobilizing the community in support of desegregation. And by the late summer, it had become clear that "local pressure combined with a national fervor for change" made it increasingly difficult for politicians and business leaders with their feet stuck in the past to thwart that change.[101]

[101] Mack Junior Sowell, interview by the author.

CHAPTER VII

LOCAL, NATIONAL, AND INTERNATIONAL CONNECTIONS

Shaw University alumna Angie Brooks entered the Sir Walter Coffee House in Raleigh on April 30, 1963 with her nephew Joseph Outland, who was then enrolled at Shaw, and North Carolina State College (NC State) assistant professor Allard Lowenstein, as well as two State College students. Because Brooks was black, she was denied service but not before the manager asked her: "Are you looking for a job?" But Brooks was looking for a place to eat, and she certainly did not need a job at a coffee house. Indeed, Brooks already had a job. She was the Liberian Ambassador to the United Nations and the Assistant Secretary of State of the West African nation. The group was also denied service at the S&W Cafeteria. The incidents prompted U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk to send Brooks an apology letter.[1]

The "Brooks Affair" revealed many of the contradictions of Tar Heel hospitality addressed in previous chapters, not the least of which was the reality that business leaders viewed Brooks as a potential employee, but not as a patron. It also demonstrated the central role that Shaw University students and alumni played in the drama over desegregation in Raleigh. With Lowenstein's presence, the episode also signified the increasing involvement of whites in the movement to end segregated practices in the city. Lowenstein's involvement brought to the forefront the issue of whether faculty members

[1] "Seeks Meal: UN Official Turned Away," *News and Observer*, 1 May 1963, 1, 2; "U.S. Agency Apologizes for Incident Here," *News and Observer*, 2 May 1963, 1.

at state-supported institutions should be disciplined or terminated for their involvement in civil rights demonstrations. Many supporters of segregation called for Lowenstein to be fired from NC State, while others defended his right to protest.[2] Lowenstein's rights to peaceful protest were part of his civil liberties as an American citizen. But for a scholar who devoted much of his attention to the study of race relations and the impact of discriminatory policies in both the United States and in Africa, any attempt to remove him from his position at NC State for his involvement in protests could reasonably be considered an infringement upon his academic freedom.

The incidents at the Sir Walter Coffee House and S&W Cafeteria illuminate one of the central themes presented in this chapter. Local movements for desegregation had regional, national, and international connections. In some cases, those connections were literal and practical. In other cases the connections were rhetorical and ideological, but they were always significant in bringing about the impetus for change. In a practical sense, some activists in Raleigh and Durham formed connections with regional and national civil rights leaders. In an ideological sense, some activists viewed their participation as an international struggle for the rights of non-white persons. Additionally, responses to local demonstrations by state and national politicians were often impacted by Cold War sensibilities, which could be used to support or discredit the demonstrations.

This chapter further explores the connection between civil rights activism and academic freedom in a local, regional, and national context. My primary argument on

---

[2] William H. Chafe, *Never Stop Running: Allard Lowenstein and the Struggle to Save American Liberalism* (New York: Basic Books, 1993), 179.

this topic is that in North Carolina in 1963, the advocates of academic freedom were generally also the advocates of civil rights for African Americans. Likewise, the opponents of academic freedom were the opponents of civil rights activism. This reality was made further evident in the North Carolina General Assembly's enactment of what became known as the Speaker Ban Law, which was ostensibly aimed at banning Communist speakers at state-supported colleges, but which many activists believed was also an attempt to thwart civil rights activism.[3] Just as college students and faculty in the Triangle had taken the primary leadership role in the civil rights protests, they also took the lead in opposing the Speaker Ban Law. Meanwhile, those in favor of the 1963 law were often the most ardent supporters of segregation, including many state legislators. The connections between academic freedom and civil rights activism were not purely unique to the Triangle, but in a region of the state containing the heart of higher education in the South, they rang truer.

The enactment of the Speaker Ban Law in 1963 represented an example of the ways in which certain state legislators and other defenders of segregation reacted to local civil rights protests by framing the demonstrations in Cold War rhetoric. Thus, local events led to reactions that were perceived in both local and international terms. The president of the segregationist North Carolina Defenders of States' Rights declared that a "Communist conspiracy to mongrelize the race" was responsible for the civil rights

[3] William J. Billingsley, *Communists on Campus: Race, Politics, and the Public University in Sixties North Carolina* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1999), 3; Mack Junior Sowell, interview by the author, digital recording, 20 April 2016, Raleigh, North Carolina; Louis Powell, interview by the author, digital recording, 13 April 2016, New Hill, North Carolina.

demonstrations in the state.[4] Yet the primary reason for the enactment of the Speaker Ban Law emanated from local protests and some members of the General Assembly's desire to thwart liberalism and civil rights activism, especially among those at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC). One legislator who opposed the law contended that a "spirit of fear and distrust" made UNC the "real object" of the law.[5] Yet, it is important to point out that the support for civil rights activism in the Triangle among some UNC faculty and students was largely a result of the demonstrations that were primarily carried out by African Americans in 1963.

The year 1963 was pivotal in the debate over which visions of freedom and democracy would prevail in the United States. The sit-ins and other forms of protest in North Carolina sought the end of segregated practices on the local level. But they were also part of a broader struggle that had wide appeals to securing ideals of freedom for all Americans, including African Americans. The civil rights protests in Raleigh and Durham and cities throughout the South and the nation in general were a precursor to the March on Washington in August 1963, an event that was largely inspired by the demonstrations of that year. The demonstrations were also a driving force for the eventual passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.[6]

Allard Lowenstein's effort to eat at the Sir Walter Coffee House and S&W Cafeteria with Angie Brooks was at once a local, regional, national, and international

---

[4] Asheville AP, "Rector Blames Reds in Racial Strife," *News and Observer*, 28 June 1963, 29.
[5] William A. Link, *William Friday: Power, Purpose, and American Higher Education* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), 115.
[6] For analysis of the ways in which demonstrations impacted the 1964 Civil Rights Act, see Kenneth T. Andrews and Sarah Gaby, "Local Protest and Federal Policy: The Impact of the Civil Rights Movement on the 1964 Civil Rights Act," *Sociological Forum*, 30 S1 (June 2015): 509-527.

event. It was a direct challenge to local customs for which Lowenstein continued to agitate against in the spring and summer of 1963 in Raleigh. Lowenstein denied that the incident had been staged. But William Chafe asserts that "Lowenstein, of course, knew exactly what he was doing." The incident itself, and the response by the U.S. State Department that implicitly disavowed North Carolina customs, was an embarrassment for North Carolina's "liberal governor," Terry Sanford. As Chafe points out, "How better to underline the stupidity of Jim Crow."[7]

Lowenstein's previous experiences had helped him to view segregation and racism in America in an international context. In 1958, he travelled to South Africa and spoke at the non-white Fort Hare University College, where he attacked apartheid but said that the United States could not be blamed since Americans were ignorant of South Africa's policies. A man from South-West Africa (modern Namibia) responded that things were so bad in his native land that "I must come *here* [South Africa] to get a breath of fresh air."[8] Prior to World War I, South-West Africa was a German colony, under which the indigenous people suffered through a campaign of genocide in the first decade of the twentieth century, which led to the death of thousands of Nama and Herero.[9] But since the Versailles Treaty in 1919, the area had been under an international mandate. By 1958, South-West Africa was nominally under the supervision of the United Nations but was actually under the control of the South African government. Lowenstein travelled to South-West Africa the following year and witnessed the horrendous conditions that black

[7] Chafe, *Never Stop Running*, 179.
[8] Chafe, *Never Stop Running*, 134.
[9] Adam Hochschild, *King Leopold's Ghost: A Story of Greed, Terror, and Heroism in Colonial Africa* (Boston: First Mariner Books, 1999), 281-282.

Africans faced. He gave testimony to the United Nations on the conditions and the oppressive system operating there. In 1962, the same year that he became a professor at NC State College, his book *Brutal Mandate* was published. Emory Bundy, who had travelled with Lowenstein to South-West Africa, noted that "I witnessed large numbers of South West Africans who had never been given cause to trust any white man place their complete trust in Al on the basis of a few hours acquaintance." Bundy also pointed to some of the most ominous warnings in Lowenstein's book, which argued that "the present state of affairs in southern Africa is as immoral as in the world today… that a change of direction must be achieved quickly if there is to be any hope of avoiding the frightful consequences of a denouement by blood."[10] Lowenstein also recognized the critical role that the United States could play in ending, or at least curtailing, the unfair system in South Africa. Furthermore, some of his contentions seemed to apply to race relations in the American South as well as South Africa: "If the explosion is violent it will be because the world outside, and especially the United States, permitted nonviolence to fail."[11]

Lowenstein made a significant contribution to the movement in Raleigh during his short time in the city. The incident at the Sir Walter and the S&W Cafeteria was symbolic of some of the ideological connections between the civil rights movement in the United States and the push for better conditions for black Africans. In early July, Lowenstein left Raleigh to participate in the civil rights movement in Mississippi and

[10] "Emory Bundy to 'Friends,'" August 23, 1962, Series 1, Box 8, Folder 258, Allard Lowenstein Papers, Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
[11] Ibid.

played a role in what became known as the Freedom Vote. He also began to help lay the foundation for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee's Freedom Summer Project for the following year. In regards to fair treatment and equal opportunities for African Americans, there was some truth to Malcolm X's assertion that "Mississippi is anywhere south of the Canadian border."[12] But by going from Raleigh to Mississippi, Lowenstein entered more hostile territory for civil rights advocates. Lowenstein expected that Mississippi would be "only somewhat worse" than North Carolina but found that it was more "like South Africa, only a little better."[13]

The crucial period of the civil rights movement in the United States in the 1950s and 1960s coincided with increased efforts among black Africans to achieve independence from European colonial powers. Historian Thomas Borstelmann argues that "the movements for racial equality and self-government that arose among the world's non-white majority during the Cold War were destined to succeed or fail, for the most part, together."[14] Many black freedom activists in the United States were inspired by African independence leaders such as Ghana's (Gold Coast before independence from Britain in 1957) Kwame Nkrumah. American civil rights leader, historian, and advocate of pan-Africanism W.E.B. DuBois left the United States to live in Ghana at the urging of

[12] Thomas Borstelmann, *The Cold War and the Color Line: American Race Relations in the Global Arena* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), 4.
[13] Richard Cummings, *The Pied Piper: Allard K. Lowenstein and the Liberal Dream* (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1985), 231.
[14] Borstelmann, *The Cold War and the Color Line*, 6.

Nkrumah. In a symbolic coincidence, DuBois died in his sleep in Ghana the night before the March on Washington.[15]

Nkrumah had attended the historically black Lincoln University in Pennsylvania in the mid-1930s. Like the civil rights movement in the United States, the movement for independence in what became Ghana was primarily nonviolent. Additionally, both movements were influenced by education in their own ways. As demonstrated in previous chapters, African Americans at historically black colleges increasingly felt that the quality education they received was not commensurate with their opportunities in a segregated society. Their training gave them confidence to strive for better opportunities, but a different effect came from education in the Gold Coast. Historian David Birmingham points out that a school education "created a unified stratum of school-leavers who identified with the Gold Coast, rather than with any one ethnic or regional section of it. Education therefore unwittingly and ironically kindled a hotbed of nationalism in which seeds of independence germinated."[16]

Although the connections between Africa and African Americans could sometimes be peripheral to the daily lives of students in Raleigh, there were some tangible connections. For instance, several African students attended Shaw University. Shaw student Carrie Gaddy (Brock) recalled a time when an African student at Shaw decided to head back to campus instead of proceeding with a group going downtown to

---

[15] David Birmingham, *Kwame Nkrumah: The Father of African Nationalism* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1998), 95; David Levering Lewis, *W.E.B. DuBois: The Fight for Equality and the American Century, 1919-1963* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1993), 569-570.
[16] Birmingham, *Kwame Nkrumah*, 4, 31.

participate in the sit-ins in February 1960. According to Brock, the student said half-jokingly, "I can't stand to see my African blood spilled."[17]

One of the most notable African students at Shaw University in the early 1960s was Edward Reynolds, and his experiences reveal some of the regional and international connections of the movement for integration in North Carolina. Reynolds was born in a small town near Accra, Ghana. In his youth, he was heavily influenced by Christian missionaries from Europe and the United States. In the late 1950s, he attended Achimota School in Accra, from which Nkrumah was an alumnus. Most of his teachers were from European countries, especially France. The piano keys that formed the crest of Achimota School symbolized the interaction between the races. As Reynolds points out, "You could play a tune with the black keys, you could play a tune with the white keys, but together for the harmony you need the black and white."[18] Reynolds was at Achimota in 1957, the year in which Martin Luther King, Jr., A. Philip Randolph, and other American civil rights leaders met Nkrumah and celebrated the occasion of Ghana's independence ceremonies. This was not only a momentous occasion for Ghanaians, but also an inspirational moment for King and other African Americans. According to Taylor Branch, King's experiences in Ghana "helped secure his belief that the *Zeitgeist*, or spirit of the age, was rising to the defense of oppressed peoples."[19]

In Ghana, Reynolds witnessed the historic occasion of independence in 1957. But in 1961, he began his journey as a participant in an era of historical change in North

---

[17] Carrie Gaddy Brock, interview by the author, digital recording, 2 March 2016, Raleigh, North Carolina.
[18] Edward Reynolds, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 20 July 2016.
[19] Edward Reynolds, phone interview by the author; Taylor Branch, *Parting the Waters: America in the King Years* (New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1988), 214.

Carolina. That year, students from Wake Forest College (Wake Forest University today) in Winston-Salem sought an African student to integrate the Baptist school. The push for integrating the school dated back to the previous decade, but the sit-in movement created further pressure. Glenn Blackburn, a Wake Forest student who played a prominent role in bringing an African student to the school, stated that "the whole topic of civil rights and integration was all over the campus that spring [1960]."[20] A small group of Wake Forest students had participated in sit-ins primarily orchestrated by students from the historically black Winston-Salem State Teachers College (Winston-Salem State University today). The spirit of the sit-in movement created more fervor for integration at Wake Forest. A group of students formed the African Student Program, and with the financial support of some faculty and staff at the college, paid for Reynolds to come to North Carolina. Yet the Board of Trustees would not be moved and Edwards was denied entrance to Wake Forest in 1961.[21]

Instead of attending the state's pre-eminent white Baptist college in 1961, Reynolds enrolled at the historically black Shaw University. The presence of an African student at Shaw was nothing new, but Reynolds's time at Shaw gave him an opportunity to interact with the black community in the American South. He was warmly welcomed by the students as well as the faculty, and he got to know President William Strassner and his wife. He also received occasional visits from Wake Forest students, especially those working to get him accepted at the school. One of the most consistent visitors was Pullen

---

[20] Lisa O'Donnell, "First Black Student at Wake Forest: 'I Didn't View It As Bravery,'" *Winston-Salem Journal,* 16 September 2012. Available at: http://www.journalnow.com/news/local/first-black-student-at-wake-forest-i-didn-t-view/article_177493fa-2d2d-5de5-aa77-6cfd252ea38e.html
[21] Ibid.

Memorial Baptist Church (Raleigh) pastor and Wake Forest graduate W.W. Finlator, an outspoken advocate for integration.[22]

On April 27, 1962, the Board of Trustees at Wake Forest voted 17-9 to end segregation in the school's undergraduate programs, and Reynolds attended the school in the fall semester of 1962. He experienced some instances of discrimination, such as the few times when someone hung a picture of a gorilla or lion with his likeness. Yet, he did not suffer from any threats of violence. Many people made a concerted effort to make him feel welcome. Fellow worshippers at local black churches gave him money and some of the custodial staff at Wake Forest gave him cake and cookies. He was warmly welcomed by several Wake Forest students and faculty, especially those who had fought so hard to gain his acceptance to the school.[23]

Reynolds's experiences in the late 1950s and early 1960s reveal many important themes related to race relations in North Carolina and beyond. First and foremost, Reynolds was not only a witness, but also a participant in historical change. Although he did not participate in any direct-action tactics such as sit-ins, he nonetheless played an important role in integration in the state by becoming one of the first of two black undergraduate students at Wake Forest. Student activists had largely paved the path for his acceptance. The sit-in movement that was led primarily by black college students had created an impetus for change that was part of the inspiration for the white students at Wake Forest to actively pursue acceptance of an African student. His experiences also demonstrate the connection between education and the push for the rights of black

[22] Edward Reynolds, phone interview by the author.
[23] Lisa O'Donnell, "First Student at Wake Forest"; Edward Reynolds, interview by the author.

people. Just as highly educated people like Nkrumah led the push for independence in Ghana, so too did black and white students play a crucial role in challenging the segregated society in the American South.

Finally, Reynolds's experiences and the 17-9 vote among the Board of Trustees in favor of integrating undergraduate programs at Wake Forest demonstrated that white North Carolinians were not a monolithic group when it came to race relations and ideas about segregation and integration. The Wake Forest Board of Trustees members were not a monolithic group themselves, and some had been influenced by the growing push for integration in the years prior to 1962. For those that sought to preserve segregation, it mattered not that Reynolds was a fellow Christian. For them, race trumped religion and humanity. Those who wanted to continue segregated practices stood in stark contrast with a fellow white Baptist, W.W. Finlator, who challenged segregation not only through his words, but through his actions. His visits to a black African at a historically black college demonstrated that Tar Heel hospitality could be defined in a way that actually extended hospitality to all races. The Raleigh pastor and the white students and faculty who visited Reynolds treated the African man as a fellow human being, a courtesy that many white southerners refused to give to fellow American citizens due to the color of their skin.

Wake Forest's integration demonstrated the existence of some of the regional and international connections in the push for improved conditions for black people. Likewise, in Durham, activists made connections with the movement for integration in Chapel Hill. Chapel Hill had an image of being a liberal college town. A long-time

black resident reflected that "Chapel Hill had an image of being very liberal outwardly. But underneath it, it was different."[24] Restaurants and other places of business in Chapel Hill remained segregated in 1963. In *Game Changers: Dean Smith, Charlie Scott, and the Era that Transformed a Southern College Town*, Art Chansky maintains, "Much of the liberal image was a fraud because little of what was being argued and proposed about ending segregation resulted in voluntary action."[25] In the summer of 1963, as more places of business began desegregating in Raleigh and Durham, Chapel Hill remained segregated. The movement in Chapel Hill involved a mix of college students and community members, including high school students. The local movement received strong support and leadership from a small group of UNC students, most notably John Dunne and Pat Cusick.[26]

Just as some UNC students became involved in the protests in Raleigh and Durham, some students from North Carolina College (NCC) played a role in the movement in Chapel Hill. Quinton Baker, who had been a critical student leader in the movement in Durham, also became heavily involved in Chapel Hill in 1963. Baker and Cusick taught young demonstrators in Chapel Hill about Gandhi and nonviolent resistance. They showed the eager protestors how to go limp when arrested and how to protect themselves in a fight. As the two college students trained the young group in the field outside of the black recreation center on Roberson Street, local police came to the fence surrounding the field and asked Cusick and Baker what kind of army they were

[24] Art Chansky, *Game Changers: Dean Smith, Charlie Scott and the Era that Transformed a Southern College Town* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016), 25.
[25] Chansky, *Game Changers*, 26.
[26] Chansky, *Game Changers*, 57, 60.

training, and for what purpose.[27] It was not an army but a group of mostly young people eager to challenge segregation directly in a nonviolent way that prepared them to protect themselves from potential violence.

In mid-1963, Baker lived with Cusick in his rental home on Spring Lane, but Cusick was eventually evicted. According to Cusick, "I was kicked out for having trash in my house—namely that's a synonym for black people."[28] The resistance to integration in Chapel Hill emboldened Cusick, as did his interaction with black activists such as Baker and Harold Foster, the editor of the *Campus Echo* at NCC and an early leader of anti-segregation demonstrations at the Carolina Theater. Cusick recalls that when he first decided to challenge integration, he opposed picketing: "When we started picketing, I wasn't that much in favor of marching. When we started marching, I was not in favor of civil disobedience. The events swept us along."[29]

For Cusick (who was attending UNC on the GI Bill and a decade or so older than most UNC students), much of his inspiration came not so much with his occasional interactions with some of the leading figures in the regional and national movement (including McKissick and King), but from the young people, including some UNC students and the black teenagers from Lincoln High School.[30] Like many of the other demonstrators, Cusick was jailed for his involvement in sit-ins at the Merchants

---

[27] Jim Wallace and Paul Dickson, *Courage in the Moment: The Civil Rights Struggle, 1961-1964* (Mineola, New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 2012), 19; John Ehle, *The Free Men* (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1965), 76-77.
[28] Pat Cusick, interview by Pamela Dean, 19 June 1989, interview L-0043, Southern Oral History Program Collection (#4007), Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, http://docsouth.unc.edu/sohp/L-0043/menu.html
[29] Ibid.
[30] Ibid.

Association and local restaurants. But as the primary leaders of the movement in Chapel Hill, and for charges related to blocking traffic and resisting arrest (a charge applied to those who went "limp" when arrested), Cusick and Baker were sentenced to prison. Cusick initially received one year in jail and a suspended two-year sentence, although he ultimately served less than a year. In addition to his prison sentence, Baker received a hundred dollar fine. Meanwhile, the co-owner of Watts Grill, who pulled her dress up and urinated on a demonstrator, and the owner of Carlton's Rock Pile, who doused demonstrators with ammonia, faced no such punishment.[31]

The interaction among activists like Cusick, Dunne, and Baker was at once personal and based on issues of social justice. Their relationship demonstrated the interaction between students from the Protest Triangle and Research Triangle schools. By living together, Cusick and Baker demonstrated that they believed in integration on a deeply personal level, in addition to the impact integration would have on society and economic opportunities. Their experience also demonstrated some of the differences in challenging segregation in a city with a historically black college (Durham) and a small town with the state's most liberal, predominantly white public university. Baker had been a crucial figure in bringing significant desegregation in public accommodations in Durham. In Chapel Hill, he and other activists faced mostly frustrating results, despite the support of some white liberals in the community and at the university.[32]

---

[31] Chansky, *Game Changers*, 60-64; Capus M. Waynick, John C. Brooks, Elsie W. Pitts, eds., *North Carolina and the Negro* (Raleigh: North Carolina Mayors' Cooperating Committee, 1964), 49; Jim Wallace and Paul Dickson, *Courage in the Moment*, 68.
[32] Pat Cusick, interview by Pamela Dean.

One of the primary goals among activists in Chapel Hill was to secure a local public accommodations agreement outlawing racial segregation. In Baker's view, "We knew in order for us to get a civil rights law that would eliminate segregation…we needed to point out that Chapel Hill was never going to voluntarily desegregate, which is what everybody was calling for at that time. Voluntary desegregation of the South, and we were saying, 'It ain't gonna happen.' And the way to demonstrate that was to target Chapel Hill, to make it a focal point of activity."[33] The decision over a public accommodations agreement was in the hands of the town's Board of Aldermen, who received significant pressure from activists to pass the measure but also pressure from local businesspersons and community members to oppose it. One of the most significant demonstrations occurred when James Farmer from the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) led nearly two hundred protestors on a thirteen-mile "Walk for Freedom" in the rain from Durham to Chapel Hill on June 12, 1963. The following day, the Board of Alderman delayed voting on the public accommodations agreement and approved a measure to negotiate further. The public accommodations bill never passed and it would not be until the 1964 Civil Rights Act was passed that Chapel Hill's remaining segregated places of business were forced to integrate.[34]

While support for demonstrations in Chapel Hill was far from universal among the faculty at UNC, several professors participated and offered encouragement, and a few were even arrested for their participation. Law professor Dr. Dan Pollitt was among the

---

[33] Quinton Baker, interview by Chris McGinnis, 23 February 2002, Interview K-0838, Southern Oral History Program Collection (#4007), Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, http://docsouth.unc.edu/sohp/K-0838/K-0838.html

[34] Chansky, *Game Changers*, 58.

most supportive. Pollitt had been involved in creating the campus NAACP and was the faculty advisor of the school's first black graduate from the undergraduate school, David Dansby. Pollitt was outspoken in his support for integration in Chapel Hill. Perhaps his most significant contribution came in the form of offering his legal opinion that a potential public accommodations bill would hold up in the courts.[35] Like fellow UNC professor Albert Ammons, NC State's Lowenstein, and Duke's Peter Klopfer, Pollitt was among the professors at the Research Triangle schools who gave their moral encouragement and utilized their knowledge and experiences to challenge segregation in the Tar Heel state.

Pollitt's experiences in the 1950s and 1960s demonstrated the connections between civil rights activism and academic freedom. Pollitt had taken a position teaching law at the University of Arkansas in 1955, but was relieved of his duties in 1957 after refusing to sign a loyalty oath. The oath required him to sign a disclaimer that he had never been a member of any subversive organization, including the NAACP, a group with which he was involved. His dismissal demonstrated how institutions in several southern states attempted to connect civil rights organizations with Communism. His refusal to sign the oath also demonstrated a commitment to academic freedom that extended beyond his activities on the campus. That same year, Pollitt accepted a job at the University of North Carolina. Pollitt later recalled that "I came to Carolina for its record of academic freedom" and due to the fact that the school administration seemed

[35] David Dansby, phone interview by the author, 14 June 2016; "Desegregation Law Shelved By Alderman," *News and Observer*, 26 June 1963, 3.

"receptive to my position."[36] Pollitt was among many white liberal intellectuals who supported civil rights activists and advocates of academic freedom.

But as civil rights activism reached new heights in 1963 in North Carolina, it became increasingly clear that the most ardent defenders of segregation were also those who sought to attack academic freedom. In late June, the North Carolina General Assembly quickly passed the "Act to Regulate Visiting Speakers," which came to be known as the Speaker Ban Law. The legislation barred known Communists, people who advocated the overthrow of the U.S. government, or those who had pled the Fifth Amendment in respect to subversive activities. The bill was essentially railroaded through the House and Senate in the waning days of the summer legislative session with very minimal debate. After the bill quickly passed in the House, Senate president Clarence Stone stifled debate, and the measure was passed in about fifteen minutes. State Senator Ralph Scott of Alamance County called it "the most outrageous abuse of the legislative process I have ever seen."[37]

There is a clear correlation between those who supported the Speaker Ban Law and those who most forcefully supported racial segregation. Stone was one of the most ardent supporters of segregation and white supremacy. Unlike many North Carolina politicians who cloaked their racism in platitudes and appeals to traditional customs, Stone's commitment to white supremacy was unmistakably clear in the 1950s and early 1960s. He was vehemently opposed to the Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of*

---

[36] "Civil Liberties Champion Dan Pollitt Dies," *Carrboro Citizen*, 5 March 2010, http://www.ibiblio.org/carrborocitizen/main/2010/03/05/legal-giant-dan-pollitt-dies/

[37] Tom Inman, "Anti-Red Measure Quickly Enacted," *News and Observer*, 26 June 1963, 1, 2.

Education and believed that the South was "still a conquered province." As William Billingsley points out, "Stone's devotion to white supremacy was as pronounced as his fealty to states' rights. These concepts had served as the twin pillars of southern politics: each had informed and reinforced the other to such an extent that they had become inseparable."[38] Billingsley maintains that Stone and other segregationists shared a conviction that civil equality with blacks threatened white identity.

Another legislator who supported racial segregation as well as the Speaker Ban Law was Representative John H. Kerr, Jr. Kerr represented rural Warren County, which contained the highest percentage of African Americans of any county in the state at over 60 percent. For Kerr and other conservative members of the General Assembly, race and power were closely connected.[39] The sit-in movement and direct challenges to segregation by activists as well as federal efforts to protect African American civil rights threatened the power of men like Kerr. His frustrations seemed to boil over on February 19, 1963. In response to North Carolina A&T acting president Lewis C. Dowdy's budget request to the Joint Appropriations Committee, Kerr asked, "Didn't students from your college take part in the sit-in strikes in Greensboro trying to do away with segregation?" When Dowdy answered with a simple "yes," Kerr retorted, "You come down here begging the white folks to give more money to your school. . . . Some of us are getting tired of it. You can strike all you please, but don't come here and beg us."[40]

---

[38] Billingsley, *Communists on Campus*, 68.
[39] Ibid., 78.
[40] Raleigh AP, "Kerr Upbraids Negro Educator," *Durham Morning Herald*, 20 February 1963, 3.

Kerr's tirade revealed many of the contradictions of the segregated South. His response to Dowdy's request implied that he and the other legislators personally gave money to the school, and that Dowdy should be appreciative of any money that came from their apparent benevolence. Kerr's reply demonstrated a paternalistic view of the relationship between white politicians and African American constituents and citizens of North Carolina, some of whom attended NC A&T. Furthermore, his response revealed his belief that the college administrator should have restricted student participation in demonstrations that sought desegregation and more broadly a fuller opportunity for African Americans to participate in American democracy and economic life. As many black college students viewed their participation in the demonstrations as part of their education and as a way of opening future opportunities, Kerr's expectation that administrators at black colleges should restrict student participation in protests revealed his lack of appreciation for the students' expanded vision of academic freedom.

One of the most outspoken supporters of the Speaker Ban Law was I. Beverly Lake, the staunch segregationist who had lost to Terry Sanford in the runoff election for governor in 1960. Lake claimed that the law has "caused howls of distress from those who have placed their faith in a welfare state for America and from others who they have tricked into believing that freedom of speech is in danger."[41] Many of Lake's supporters also defended the Speaker Ban. At a "white" rally in a field next to Wilkins airstrip about ten miles from Durham, approximately 250 white men and women listened to speakers that complained about the "invasion of human rights by Negroes." One of the speakers

[41] Parkton AP, "Beverly Lake Backs Anti-Communist Law," *Durham Morning Herald*, 5 July 1963, 10A.

claimed that the "NAACP is Communist-backed and supported to divide and defeat the people of America." Another man who directed the local campaign for Lake for governor in 1960 spoke in favor of the Speaker Ban Law and attacked those who criticized it.[42]

While many defenders of segregation supported the Speaker Ban Law, opposition to the law was strong particularly among college administrators, professors, and students. Opponents of the law viewed it as an attack on academic freedom, as it limited professor's ability to bring in certain speakers and the ability for students to engage with the ideas of Communism. North Carolina State Chancellor John Caldwell called the law a "Berlin Wall of the mind."[43] The president of Duke University, whose school was not impacted since it was a private institution, said Duke had no such regulation since "we feel that it is desirable to expose students to as many opinions as possible." UNC Chancellor William B. Aycock called the Speaker Ban Law "the sloppiest bit of legislation I have ever seen."[44] Thus, opposition to the law was unanimous among the presidents of the Research Triangle schools.

The presidents of historically black colleges in the Triangle also opposed the Speaker Ban Law. Saint Augustine's College president James Boyer argued that "students have long repudiated the idea of 'cloistered virtue,' and want to challenge Communism's ideas first hand."[45] Alfonso Elder, president of the state supported North

---

[42] Pat Carter, "Negro Invasion of Rights is Charged at White Rally," *Durham Morning Herald*, 14 July 1963, 1.
[43] Alice Elizabeth Reagan, *North Carolina State University: A Narrative History* (Raleigh: The North Carolina State University Foundation, Inc., 1987), 188.
[44] "Aycock Makes Blistering Attack on Speaker Ban," *News and Observer*, 11 November 1963, 8.
[45] Tom Inman, "School Chiefs Urge Repeal of Gag Bill," *News and Observer*, 20 July 1963, 1.

Carolina College at Durham said the law "denies individuals the rights and responsibility to explore and develop their own sense of values."[46] Ultimately, the leaders of both traditionally white and historically black colleges in the Triangle recognized that the Speaker Ban Law was a restriction on academic freedom. To the opponents of the bill, the law was an example of the type of restriction on freedom of speech and academic freedom that were the hallmarks of Communist societies from the Soviet Union to China to Cuba.

The Speaker Ban Law was not only an attempt to prohibit Communists from speaking on state supported campuses. It was also an effort to thwart the momentum of the civil rights demonstrations. Shaw University student and protest leader Mack Sowell recalled, "We felt that it had nothing to do with Communists." Sowell believed it "was a restriction on African American speakers whom they felt were stirring up people to do things…it was an attempt to quell it, particularly on the state campuses of North Carolina—[the legislators were saying] you're not going to come here and stir up trouble."[47] Sowell also believes that the hastily enacted bill had something to do with the civil rights demonstrations that were taking place at the Sir Walter Hotel, where many of the legislators lodged and dined. Louis Powell, a 1962 graduate of Shaw University, recalled that like many Shaw students, he was very much opposed to the law. "I felt it was designed specifically to control some of the changes that we were hoping would take

[46] Inman, "School Chiefs Urge Repeal."
[47] Mack Sowell, interview by the author.

place [in regards to desegregation and increasing opportunities for African Americans]."[48]

Many African Americans and whites who supported black civil rights believed there was a connection between the Speaker Ban Law and efforts at thwarting civil rights dialogue and protests. Comments made during that period and in subsequent years by members of the General Assembly reinforce the connection. One legislator recollected that the presence of white professors at the demonstrations was a major factor in bringing about the law. Another representative, George Uzell, recalled in 1965 that the "the Speaker Ban Law was originally passed more to curb civil rights demonstrations than to stop Communist speakers on state campuses."[49] Uzell introduced an antitrespassing bill in 1963, providing for stiffer fines and jail sentences for trespassing, a response to the sit-ins of that year.[50] Like other legislators, including Stone and Kerr, Jr., Uzell represented the connection between efforts to preserve segregation and efforts to limit academic freedom and free speech.

One of the most outspoken supporters of the Speaker Ban Law was WRAL editorialist Jesse Helms, who praised the law as a "strong blow for freedom."[51] Herein lies the ultimate irony of those who supported the Speaker Ban Law. It restricted freedom of speech and the ability for college students to think critically to form their own opinions about a competing system of government and economy. In short, the law was the type of restriction on free speech and critical thinking that characterized many

---

[48] Louis Powell, interview by the author.
[49] Billingsley, *Communists on Campus*, 62-63.
[50] Billingsley, *Communists on Campus*, 59.
[51] William A. Link, *Righteous Warrior: Jesse Helms and the Rise of Modern Conservatism* (New York: St. Martin's Press), 85.

communist regimes. Helms was undoubtedly an anti-Communist, but like many southern politicians, he conflated Communism with civil rights activism. He also exhibited an anti-intellectual strain that was common among conservative politicians in the state. Both as an editorialist and later as a U.S. Senator, he often targeted UNC liberals. His circular logic appealed to many defenders of segregation. While many supporters of desegregation recognized the connections between academic freedom and civil rights activism, Helms had a much different view. For Helms, the "two-word catechisms of 'academic freedom' and civil rights'" were meaningless. Academic freedom had "little to do with freedom," and the "rights we hear so much about are not very civil."[52]

Ultimately, the Speaker Ban Law was amended in 1965 after the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) notified UNC officials that it jeopardized the university's accreditation. The final death blow came in 1968 when a federal court struck down the law as "unconstitutional because of vagueness." Pollitt had played a role in the case by filing amicus curiae brief on behalf of the North Carolina Civil Liberties Union.[53] In a 1991 interview, Pollitt reflected that "the Speaker Ban Law, I thought, was a result of racism." He believed it was largely a response to the sit-ins and protests gripping cities throughout the state, including in the Triangle. He believed that Angie Brooks and Allard Lowenstein attempting to eat at the Sir Walter was part of what precipitated the Speaker Ban. According to Pollitt, the law was "anti-university and it was anti-Chapel Hill and it was anti-Al Lowenstein at State and all the black

[52] Link, *Righteous Warrior*, 86.
[53] Link, *Righteous Warrior*, 88; William Billingsley, *Communists on Campus*, 215, 218.

campuses."[54] For Pollitt, the Speaker Ban Law demonstrated the connection between the opponents of African American civil rights and those who sought to restrict free speech and academic freedom. In contrast, many of the most outspoken proponents of academic freedom were also those who advocated for increased African American civil rights and economic opportunities. The connection between civil rights activism and academic freedom was not unique to the Triangle. But in a sub-region of the South, which included the most prestigious private institution (Duke), the oldest public university that had traditionally been a staunch supporter of academic freedom (UNC), as well as three historically black colleges that were instrumental in the sit-in movement, the connection was even clearer than in other parts of the South.

Civil rights activists who opposed the Speaker Ban Law did so not because they were in favor of communism, but because they rejected restrictions on free speech and recognized that segregationists often falsely portrayed civil rights leaders as communists. The student leaders from historically black colleges in the Triangle did not seek to overthrow the American government, but rather to force it to live up to its professed ideals of democracy and equality. Most students at the "Protest Triangle" schools did not have any communist friends and knew of very few communists in Raleigh or Durham. Frank Porter Graham, the former president of the Consolidated University of North Carolina, who was a United Nations mediator in 1963, stated that civil rights activists "are not trying to overthrow the Republic. Rather, they are trying to fulfill the promise of

[54] Dan Pollitt, interview by Ann McColl, Interview L-0064-7, Southern Oral History Program Collection (#4007), Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, http://docsouth.unc.edu/sohp/L-0064-7/L-0064-7.html

the Republic made on July 4, 1776, in Philadelphia." Graham denied segregationist claims that "the Southern Youth Movement started in Moscow." In Graham's estimation, "It started in Greensboro at A&T College."[55]

There was no escaping Cold War rhetoric as it related to race relations in the United States. Both integrationists and segregationists used appeals to Cold War sensibilities to defend their positions. But there was little doubt that the harsh reaction to some civil rights demonstrations hurt America's image abroad and provided propaganda opportunities for nations such as Cuba, the Soviet Union, and China, as well as the countries they sought to influence. The incidents of violence and police brutality in Birmingham in the late spring of 1963 were especially powerful symbols of American racism exploited by Soviet propaganda. A group of North Carolina civic leaders, including Chapel Hill mayor Sandy McClamroch, Jr. and Fayetteville mayor Wilbur Clark, toured Eastern Europe in late September 1963. Upon returning, Clark reflected that "the race question is definitely being used against us in propaganda." But he also stated that the people in the region did not ask them about the race problem, and that "the people we meet either are more concerned with their own problems or they don't believe all they read." Perhaps the most telling comment came from a Russian man in Moscow, who approached the group of North Carolinians and said, "America good, Alabama bad."[56]

---

[55] "4-H Hears Graham Back Integration," *News and Observer*, 24 July 1963, 7.
[56] Warsaw, Poland AP, "Tar Heels Find Racial Question Seldom Asked," *News and Observer*, 7 October 1963, 3.

The Russian man's words shed light on the views of some people in the Soviet sphere of influence. But his words also provide a window to the view of many Americans. Many Americans were appalled when they viewed scenes of police utilizing dogs or protestors being knocked down by fire hoses. But some white Americans refused to fully acknowledge the racism and systemic discrimination outside of the South or even the Deep South. Iconic images of violence toward demonstrators, whether by police or ordinary citizens, helped awaken the conscience of some Americans. But those images often gave comfort to racial "moderates" who believed that racial discrimination was not as bad where they lived as in Alabama or Mississippi. There is little doubt that the visceral response by many citizens and politicians to civil rights activism in states like Alabama and Mississippi were indeed worse than in most other areas of the country. But systemic racism in the form of employment discrimination, housing discrimination, and unequal access to services, as well as informal prejudice was an American problem, not just a southern problem.[57]

The Cold War heavily influenced reactions to racial issues among American politicians. Concern about America's image abroad certainly impacted President Kennedy's approach to civil rights issues. But one should not underestimate the impact that several local movements, led by mostly unheralded (and unknown today by most Americans) activists, had in bringing about a change in approach by key government leaders, including Kennedy. Civil rights activists in the Triangle were among the

[57] For analysis of race relations and the struggle for civil rights in the North, see Thomas J. Sugrue, *Sweet Land of Liberty: The Forgotten Struggle for Civil Rights in the North* (New York: Random House, 2008); Martha Biondi, *To Stand and Fight: The Struggle for Civil Rights in Postwar New York City* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006).

thousands of protestors who pushed Kennedy into a more proactive approach to civil rights for African Americans in 1963. As sociologists Kenneth T. Andrews and Sarah Gaby point out, the Kennedy Administration had taken a mostly reactive or crisis management approach to civil rights issues in his first two years as president.[58] For example, in response to the violence that the Freedom Rides provoked from hostile whites in 1961, Attorney General Robert Kennedy sent federal marshals and pressured Alabama Governor John Patterson to deploy the Alabama National Guard to protect the Riders. Yet, Robert Kennedy derided the Riders and criticized them for "providing good propaganda for America's enemies."[59] Of course, it was not the Freedom Riders who ultimately provided propaganda for enemies like the Soviet Union, but rather, social practices and a political system in the South that tolerated extreme racial prejudice, which went largely (albeit not completely) unchallenged by the federal government for nearly a century. Ultimately, Robert Kennedy instructed the Justice Department to push the Interstate Commerce Commission to ban segregation and discrimination in interstate travel, which became effective on November 1, 1961. As Adam Fairclough points out, "The Freedom Rides had forced the Kennedy Administration to act against its will."[60]

By the summer of 1963, the Kennedy Administration was pressured into taking a more proactive approach on civil rights issues. Activists throughout the South had staged hundreds of sit-ins, marches, and boycotts in the spring and summer, while activists in other regions of the United States supported desegregation and emphasized economic

[58] Andrews and Gaby, "Local Protest and Federal Policy," 510.
[59] Adam Fairclough, *Better Day Coming: Blacks and Equality, 1890-2000* (New York: Penguin Books, 2001), 255.
[60] Ibid.

concerns. With the increasing activism in the spring of 1963, Department of Justice officials began tracking civil rights demonstrations. Between May 20 and August 8, the Department noted 978 demonstrations in 29 cities, most of which targeted public accommodations. Throughout much of June and early July, Robert Kennedy and other government officials met with various groups, including governors, hotel, restaurant, and theater owners, educators, and civil rights activists to discuss civil rights issues and desegregation.[61] It is quite clear that civil rights activists had played a crucial role in pushing the Kennedy Administration toward a more proactive stance.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was not born in the halls of Congress or in the Oval Office. Rather, it was a political and moral response to the activists on the streets and at the lunch counters in Greensboro, Raleigh, Nashville, Birmingham, and dozens of other cities in the South and throughout the nation. President Kennedy's speech on June 11, 1963 in which he called for legislation that, among other things, would mandate the desegregation of public accommodations, signified his willingness to take a leadership role in pushing for legislation. But it is important to recognize that he had been pushed into such a stance by the thousands of activists throughout the South and the rest of the nation.[62]

June 11, 1963, was a crucial and symbolic day in the history of race relations in the United States. It was at once sensational, inspiring, and tragic. It revealed the tensions between southern politicians and federal agencies as well as the willingness

---

[61] Andrews and Gaby, "Local Protest and Federal Policy," 521.
[62] Richard C. Cortner, *Civil Rights and Public Accommodations: The* Heart of Atlanta Motel *and* McClung *Cases* (Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 2001), 14, 17.

among some southerners to continue to use terror as a tool in preserving segregation. The first major event of June 11 was Alabama Governor George Wallace's dramatic and carefully staged act of literally standing in the doorway of the auditorium at the University of Alabama to attempt to deny the registration of an African American. On June 2, Wallace had reiterated his campaign promise to stand in the door and maintained that the issue was more than that of integration at the University of Alabama. He claimed he wanted to help stop "the march of centralized government that is going to destroy the rights and freedom and liberty of the people of this country."[63] As southern politicians had done for generations, Wallace defended the denial of basic rights to African Americans by portraying federal efforts to secure such rights as a restriction on the freedom of Americans, namely white Americans.

Wallace's stance in the doorway provided him with an opportunity to publicly show his hardline defense of segregation. He understood that he could not officially block the admission of James Hood and Vivian Malone in the wake of a federal judge's decision the previous week that ultimately prohibited Wallace from interfering with their admission. Unlike the thousands of civil rights activists throughout the country, Wallace was ostensibly not willing to risk jail for his own particular vision of American freedom. As deputy attorney general Nicholas Katzenbach approached Wallace, he declared, "I have come here to ask now for unequivocal assurance that you will permit these students who, after all, merely want an education in the Great University." Wallace interrupted by saying, "Now you make your statement, but we don't need a speech." Ironically,

[63] Dan T. Carter, *The Politics of Rage: George Wallace, the Origins of the New Conservatism, and the Transformation of American Politics* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2000), 137.

Wallace then gave a four-page speech denouncing "this illegal and unwarranted action by the Central Government." Ultimately, Katzenbach returned to his car and then walked Vivian Malone to her dormitory across the parking lot, while Justice Department officials drove Hood to his dorm. Later that day, Malone (who, like Hood, had already quietly pre-registered at the Birmingham courthouse with the cooperation of the University) went to the cafeteria and sat down. Six students came and sat at the table and introduced themselves.[64] It was an inspiring act of humanity that demonstrated that not every white southerner could be grouped in the same category as George Wallace.

That evening President Kennedy addressed the nation on national television. The speech revealed the impact that the civil rights demonstrations throughout the country had on pushing him to advocate for federal legislation. He stated that the nation faced a "moral crisis" that "cannot be left to increased demonstrations in the streets. It cannot be quieted by token moves or talk." He told the American people that in the following week he would ask the Congress to act and "make a commitment that it has not fully made in this century to the proposition that race has no place in American life or law." Kennedy also recognized the connection between education and civil rights activism. He implored the nation to recognize that "we cannot say to 10 percent of the population…that your children can't have the chance to develop whatever talents they have, that the only way they have to get their rights is to go in the streets and demonstrate."[65]

---

[64] Carter, *The Politics of Rage*, 148-150.
[65] *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: John F. Kennedy, 1963* (Washington, D.C: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964), 468-471.

President Kennedy's speech demonstrated his commitment to civil rights legislation that had been inspired by activism and demonstrations in several cities throughout the United States. As historian Robert Weisbrot points out, "There could be no turning back. The President had fully committed the authority of his office—and his political future—to continued civil rights progress."[66] The June 11 speech was perhaps the most significant moment in demonstrating Kennedy's commitment to civil rights issues, but it is important to note that he had been pressured, both directly and indirectly, by civil rights activists to do so. By the summer of 1963, it was clear to Kennedy that taking a reactive stance toward civil rights issues was no longer a tenable approach.

Civil rights activists in Raleigh and Durham and throughout the nation were encouraged by Kennedy's speech on June 11. But for many activists the excitement was short-lived, as news of tragedy came from Mississippi. Shortly after midnight (and thus, technically on June 12), NAACP organizer and World War II veteran Medgar Evers returned to his home in Jackson after a long strategy meeting, unaware that Byron de la Beckwith waited behind a clump of honeysuckle vines in an empty lot near the house. Historian Dan T. Carter vividly describes the tragic event that followed: "Beckwith peered through the scope of his 30.06 bolt-action Winchester; Evers's white shirt offered a perfect target in the harsh light of the carport's naked bulb. As Evers reached for the handle of the kitchen door, the steel-jacketed bullet ripped through his back between the

[66] Robert Weisbrot, *Freedom Bound: A History of America's Civil Rights Movement* (New York: Penguin Books, 1990), 76.

tenth and eleventh rib; exiting, it left a massive hole just below the sternum. He died within the hour."[67]

The assassination of Medgar Evers was a chilling reminder that some southerners would continue to utilize terror as a weapon against civil rights activism. But Kennedy's speech earlier that evening was an example that the civil rights demonstrations throughout the nation were having an impact on national political leaders. While activists in Raleigh and Durham sought to bring about changes in segregated practices on a local level, they also understood that their actions had national implications as well. They also recognized that white political leaders would not "bestow freedom" upon them, and that African Americans needed to push for changes in laws to afford them equal social and economic opportunities.[68] Students from the "Protest Triangle" schools recognized that their activism played a role in Kennedy's support for civil rights legislation and in the ultimate passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Vannie Culmer, a 1963 North Carolina College graduate, recalled that throughout the country, student activists "were one of the galvanizing forces" that led to the Civil Rights Act.[69]

President Kennedy's support for civil rights legislation did not begin on June 11, 1963. In a February 28 address to Congress, he outlined some of the basic tenets that would ultimately be included in the Civil Rights Act of 1964. He touted some actions taken by the federal government, including bringing about the end to discrimination in rail and bus lines in 1961 and Justice Department efforts to bring about desegregation in

---

[67] Carter, *The Politics of Rage*, 153.
[68] See appendix for survey results.
[69] Vannie C. Culmer, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 26 January 2017.

fifteen airports in 1962.[70] But his speech on June 11 represented a clearer commitment to supporting civil rights legislation and a more aggressive effort to appeal to American citizens for support. His continuous references to protest demonstrations reveal the impact that they had on pushing Kennedy into a more proactive stance. He realized that "the events in Birmingham and elsewhere have so increased the cries for equality that no city or state or legislative body can prudently choose to ignore them."[71] Undoubtedly, the movement in Birmingham and the reaction to it by segregationists provided dramatic scenes that pushed Kennedy to take a more proactive stance on civil rights issues. But it was not just sensational events like the use of fire hoses and police dogs, or Wallace's stance in the doorway. These were merely iconic images that helped to reveal the ugliest aspects of the response to demonstrations and efforts to achieve integration. The true momentum for civil rights legislation came from the thousands of demonstrators throughout the South and the rest of the country, most of whom never appeared on the front page of newspapers or heard their names on the evening news.

By June 1963, Kennedy and members of his administration fully recognized that national political leaders could no longer take a tentative approach to civil rights issues. In late June, Senator Hugh Scott (R-Pa.) asked Katzenbach why President Kennedy had waited for nearly two and a half years to submit the seven-point civil rights bill to Congress. He specifically asked, "Was your hand forced by the demonstrations?" Katzenbach replied that since Kennedy offered his limited civil rights program in

---

[70] "Special Message on Civil Rights," 28 February 1963, *Papers of John F. Kennedy*, President's Office Files, Legislative Files, John F. Kennedy Presidential Library, Boston, Massachusetts.
[71] *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: John F. Kennedy, 1963*, 468-471.

February "things had moved very fast," an indicator that the demonstrations had added a sense of urgency.[72] The administration realized that the mass demonstrations throughout the country were not an ephemeral phenomenon; significant efforts needed to be taken not merely to quell the demonstrations but for the nation to live up to its ostensible ideals of equality, freedom, and democracy.

Civil rights activists in the early 1960s realized that the struggle for equal opportunities was one that needed to be pursued by every generation. Since the Civil War, African Americans had made many economic, educational, and social advances. But the march toward freedom was not a straight line toward increased opportunities. Indeed, one of the most significant portions of the civil rights bill that was proposed in 1963 and ultimately passed in 1964 sought to re-establish and guarantee some of the rights which were afforded to all races in the Civil Rights Act of 1875. The 1875 Civil Rights Act held that U.S. citizens of every race and color "shall be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of the accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of inns, public conveyances on land and water, theaters, and other places of public amusement." Yet, the Civil Rights Act of 1875 was deemed unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in 1883. Despite the strong dissent from Justice John Marshall Harlan, the majority of the Court held that the 1875 Act had exceeded the power of the Congress to enforce provisions of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments. The majority opinion held that the Equal Protection Clause in the Fourteenth Amendment was aimed at prohibiting state actions which denied the rights protected by the amendment. The Court specifically

[72] Washington AP, "Civil Rights at Local Level Described as Best Solution," *Durham Morning Herald*, 1 July 1963, 1.

stated, "Individual invasion of individual rights is not the subject matter of the Amendment."[73]

Civil rights activists at the "Protest Triangle" schools were acutely aware of both the advances that African Americans had made since the Civil War, and the limitations they faced. As the oldest black institution of higher learning in the South, Shaw University served as a bastion of black higher education for nearly a century by 1963. Shaw students believed that they had received a quality education that had prepared them to make valuable contributions to American society and an education that should have qualified them for better opportunities than what existed in American society. The sit-ins and other protests were a way of challenging segregated practices in places of public accommodations but also served to make clear that African Americans were not content with hiring discrimination and restrictions in economic opportunities. Floyd McKissick, the recently named national director of CORE and a man very much in tune with the aspirations of black college students in Durham, spoke at Duke University in late October and said that many black youth asked themselves, "why bother" to get an education if they could not get a quality job after graduation.[74] But for students that were already attending historically black colleges, their participation in the demonstrations served as a way of promoting the process of making their educational attainment match their opportunities.

---

[73] Cortner, *Civil Rights and Public Accommodations*, 2-3.
[74] Durham AP, "CORE Official Heard in Duke Camps Speech," *News and Observer*, 1 November 1963, 12.

Largely due to the sit-ins and other demonstrations, activists had helped achieve some desegregation in Raleigh by the end of 1963. A report of the Mayor's Community Relations Committee stated that blacks had gained access to all of the indoor theaters, two motels, and about one-third of the restaurants in Raleigh. The report also cited significant gains in black employment in both city, federal, and state government, as well as some modest gains in employment opportunities in the private sector. Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the report was its specific reference to the impact that the demonstrations had in bringing about desegregation and increases in employment opportunities. It stated that the pace of desegregation in the city was "stimulated by the crisis created by the street demonstrations in the spring and summer of 1963."[75]

In Durham, even more extensive desegregation had taken place by the summer of 1963, as 90 percent of the gross food business in the city had been desegregated. In addition, the Durham Junior Chamber of Commerce accepted its first African American member on July 9, Asa T. Spaulding, Jr., who was the president of North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance, one of the largest black-owned companies in the nation. In both Raleigh and Durham, significant desegregation of public accommodations had occurred and some gains had been achieved in reducing hiring discrimination and increasing economic opportunities prior to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and even prior to Kennedy's proposal to Congress for legislation on June 19, 1963.[76]

---

[75] Jonathan Friendly, "Negro Gains Cited In Raleigh Report," *News and Observer*, 14 December 1963, 20.
[76] Jon Phelps, "90 Pct. of Durham Eating Facilities Now Desegregated," *Durham Morning Herald*, 19 June 1963, 1; "Jaycees Here Admit Negro As Member," *Durham Sun*, 10 July 1963, 13B.

Nonetheless, activists in Raleigh and Durham realized that federal legislation could help solidify gains that they had made as well as secure additional opportunities for the future. Their actions in their respective cities had brought about significant local change, and they were part of a broader movement that sparked change on a regional and national level. They had already participated in several historic moments, and in August 1963, many participated in one of the most historic moments in the nation's history.

Scores of citizens from Raleigh and Durham packed into buses headed for the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom on August 28, 1963, while others drove their own cars to the historic gathering. The Durham bus contingent departed from Saint Joseph A.M.E. Church and arrived in the nation's capital around 9 A.M. Students, including those from NCC, made up a significant portion of the group from Durham. Like the others, they were participants in, not simply witnesses to, the historic event. They viewed their involvement as a carryover from the protests in Durham and other cities throughout the country. The buses transported both black and whites to the historic event. Thus, in a literal and figurative sense, the trip to Washington had been prepared by the prior activism that challenged segregation in the two North Carolina cities and other cities throughout the country.[77]

Floyd McKissick, the recently elected CORE national chairman, was one of the Durhamites who played a significant role at the March on Washington. He was one of the speakers, among an impressive list including Martin Luther King, Jr., A. Philip

[77] Phelps, "McKissick in Key Role: Number From City in March," *Durham Morning Herald*, 29 August 1963, 1B; Fay Bryant Mayo, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 1 February 2017; Millie Dunn Veasey, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 27 June 2016; Mildred (Campbell) Christmas, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 10 September 2016.

Randolph, and John Lewis, and he also met with President Kennedy that day. McKissick represented CORE in the absence of its executive director James Farmer, who was in jail for involvement in civil rights protests in Louisiana.[78] McKissick was an example of a prominent civil rights leader who recognized the important role which students from historically black colleges played in pushing the movement forward in 1963 and in providing momentum for the March on Washington. From the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, McKissick delivered Farmer's address while Bayard Rustin, the man who had been arrested in North Carolina sixteen years prior, stood behind him. Perhaps the phrase that captured the significance of all the local movements and their representation at the march was "play well your roles in your struggle for freedom. In the thousands of communities in which you have come throughout the land, act with valor and dignity, and act without fear."[79]

The group that came from Raleigh to the nation's capital included some of the most significant figures who helped challenge segregated practices in the capital city of North Carolina, including NAACP President Ralph Campbell, Sr. and Shaw Dean of Religion, Grady Davis. Campbell did not bring his youngest son William, who had integrated Murphey Elementary School in 1960, but he did bring his daughter Mildred and son, Ralph, Jr. Mildred recalled that they were participants, not merely witnesses, at the March on Washington. As a student at J.W. Ligon High School in Raleigh, she had

---

[78] Jon Phelps, "McKissick in Key Role," 1B; McKissick had been elected as the national chairman at the national CORE meeting in Dayton, Ohio, on June 29, 1963: See Dayton Ohio UPI, "McKissick Elected CORE Chairman at National Meet," *Durham Morning Herald*, 30 June 1963, 4.

[79] Josh Shaffer, "50 Years Later, Local Memories of a March, a Speech, and MLK," *News and Observer*, 25 August 2013, http://www.newsobserver.com/2013/08/25/3135008/50-years-later-memories-of-a-march.html

participated in protest marches in the city, which often began at the Shaw campus. "We were a participant in the civil rights movement, because we participated in the marches and the demonstrations. We were involved in the struggles here in Raleigh, but also to a wider range, the March on Washington, so we were willing to go and participate in that too…it was a continuous struggle."[80]

Another young Raleigh citizen took a less conventional path to the March on Washington. Without his parents' knowledge, Ligon High School student Bruce Lightner packed up his schoolbag with a peanut butter and jelly sandwich and a jar of Kool-Aid and proceeded to hitchhike to the March on Washington. He eventually encountered a group from Raleigh, including Dr. John Fleming of the Raleigh Citizens Association, whom he rode home with. Lightner recalls that when he returned, his father, who operated Lightner Funeral Home and eventually became Raleigh's first black mayor a decade later, told his son, "I am mad at you. But I'm also proud of you."[81]

The Citizens of Raleigh that participated in the March on Washington recognized its importance for furthering a message of justice and equality for which many of them had already struggled in their own city. One participant from Raleigh reflected, "It was a mighty fine demonstration and showed that Negroes really believe in the things we are fighting for. I certainly hope the oppressors will catch the message." An employee at Saint Augustine's College recalled the significance of the experience and included the hope that was reflected in "We Shall Overcome," the anthem of the movement: "I am

---

[80] Mildred (Campbell) Christmas, phone interview by the author; "Capital City Represented in 'March,'" *Carolinian*, 31 August 1963, 1.

[81] Shaffer, "50 Years Later, Local Memories of a March, A Speech and MLK"; "Capital City Represented in 'March,'" 1; Bruce Lightner, interview by the author, digital recording, 16 June 2016, Raleigh, North Carolina.

glad that I could participate in the March on Washington for Freedom and Jobs. It was a reminder of hope, sacrifice and of faith. Deep in my heart I do believe that we shall overcome some day."[82]

The student-led protest movements in Raleigh and Durham were part of a broader assault on segregation and discriminatory practices in the South and throughout the country. At the local level, they played the crucial role in pressuring local businesses to desegregate places of public accommodations. In 1963, black activists received increasing support from whites who were sympathetic to their cause. They found support from students and faculty from two institutions, UNC and Duke University, which had often defended academic freedom. For professors, academic freedom had allowed for more thoughtful and reasoned discussions of race relations, and even the ability to join the demonstrations. For black students who viewed the demonstrations as part of their education, their vision of academic freedom included the right to protest without interference from college administrations or local or state politicians.

The March on Washington was in many ways the zenith of a movement that had already made significant gains in various communities throughout the country, albeit one which recognized there was much work left to be done. The movements in Raleigh and Durham were similar to those in other cities, in that they had regional, national, and international implications. Incidents such as the denial of service to Angie Brooks at the Sir Walter Coffee House in Raleigh demonstrated that local movements could not be

[82] "'Marchers' Report on Experience," *Carolinian*, 7 September 1963, 1.

neatly separated from national and international conceptions about the role of race in determining how societies and governments should operate.

Although some civil rights leaders such as John Lewis remained unimpressed with the civil rights bill that ultimately passed in 1964, the March on Washington nonetheless played a role in drawing further attention to civil rights issues and garnering support for the legislation.[83] But it is significant to note that the mass demonstrations throughout the country, including those in Raleigh and Durham, played a significant role in pushing the Kennedy Administration toward support for civil rights legislation.

Like the other more than two hundred thousand black and white Americans who attended the March on Washington, those from Raleigh and Durham listened intently to Martin Luther King's eloquent and moving "I Have a Dream" speech. For many, this was not the first time they had heard him address a crowd. Some heard him address the crowd of over a thousand people at White Rock Baptist Church in Durham in the wake of the first week of sit-ins in February 1960, in which King termed the sit-in protests "one of the most significant developments in the civil rights struggle."[84] Others had personally met the civil rights leader, while others saw him speak at Raleigh's Memorial Auditorium on April 16, 1960, as part of the activities of the Youth Leadership Conference on Nonviolent Resistance at Shaw University. At the Raleigh speech, King asserted that the demonstrations by black college students were part of a "world-wide revolution," and he also pointed out, "These students have made it clear that segregation is a cancer in the

[83] Washington AP, "Big 'Freedom' March Is Staged By 200,000," *News and Observer*, 29 August 1963, 1. SNCC leader John Lewis's initial draft speech did not support the Kennedy administration's bill, but he ultimately changed it to say "we support the administration's civil rights bill, but with reservations."
[84] Gene Roberts, Jr., "Negro Leader Urges Students to Continue Segregation Protest," *News and Observer*, 17 February 1960, 1, 2.

body politic."[85] While the content and theme of the speech in April 1960, and that of August 1963, were different, they both shared a common characteristic. They both had been impacted by a movement that had been carried primarily by black college students and other largely unheralded individuals in several cities throughout the South and the nation, including those in Raleigh and Durham. In one of the most iconic moments in American history, King passionately delivered the message. But activists like David Forbes, Lacy Streeter, Barbara Woodhouse, Mack Sowell, and Quinton Baker had prepared the stage.

[85] "At Meeting Here: Negroes Discuss Regional Plans," *News and Observer*, 17 April 1960, 1, 2.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION: THE LEGACY OF THE "PROTEST TRIANGLE" ACTIVISTS

In early July 1964, Shaw University graduate Albert Sampson entered the Heart of Atlanta Motel in downtown Atlanta and was told by the owner, "I can't accommodate any Negroes." The owner refunded the room deposit, which Sampson had previously wired to the motel. The motel's denial of service to the African American man violated the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which prohibited racial discrimination in public accommodations. Sampson, who was then the executive director of the Atlanta branch of the NAACP, testified in the U.S. Supreme Court case, *Heart of Atlanta Motel v. United States*, that the owner told him that he "had a suit against the federal government on this same basic situation and he said that if the courts decide for me to open up, I'll open up; but until then I can't accommodate any Negroes."[1] Ultimately, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled against the Heart of Atlanta Motel and sustained the arguments made by government lawyers that the denial of service based on race violated the Civil Rights Act, primarily based on Congress's right to regulate interstate commerce.[2] John Lewis, the SNCC leader and former Fisk University student who participated in the Youth Leadership Conference on Nonviolent Resistance at Shaw University in April 1960, hailed the ruling as "the landmark in the struggle for complete social, economic, and

[1] Richard C. Cortner, *Civil Rights and Public Accommodations: The* Heart of Atlanta Motel *and* McClung *Cases* (Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 2001), 1, 42-43; Albert Sampson, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 12 July 2016.
[2] Cortner, *Civil Rights and Public Accommodations*, 171-174.

political equality for all Americans" and that the case "vindicated the thousands of demonstrators who made the civil rights bill not only possible but imperative."[3]

Sampson's involvement in the effort to integrate the Heart of Atlanta Motel represented a continuation of his civil rights activism in Raleigh during his time as a student at Shaw University. It was also indicative of the ways in which students from the "Protest Triangle" schools continued the struggle for social justice and improving opportunities for African Americans in the years after their graduation. Sampson, the former Shaw University student body president and campus NAACP president, was appointed by Martin Luther King, Jr. as the National Housing Director of SCLC in the mid-1960s. He was also a speaker at the Million Man March in 1995. He has served as a pastor at Fernwood United Methodist Church in Chicago and founded "George Washington Carver F.A.R.M.S. (Farmer's Agricultural Resources Management System)," which assists black farmers in the South in marketing and selling their crops to customers in the North.[4]

Sampson was among the many activists from the "Protest Triangle" schools who realized that political leaders rarely "bestow" freedom upon minorities, and that every generation must struggle for social justice and for government to be responsive to its citizens, regardless of race. Like other student activists, he also viewed his participation in civil rights demonstrations as part of his education and as a way of opening future opportunities. Civil rights activists in Raleigh and Durham helped push for a more open

---

[3] Linda McClain, "Involuntary Servitude, Public Accommodations Laws and the Legacy of *Heart of Atlanta, Inc. v. United States*," *University of Maryland Law Review*, 71, 83 (2011): 119.
[4] Albert Sampson, phone interview by the author; National Parks Service, International Civil Rights Walk of Fame, "Rev. Dr. Albert Sampson," https://www.nps.gov/features.malu/feat0002/wof/Albert_Sampson.htm

society, which paved the way for impressive accomplishments. William Campbell, the seven-year-old boy who integrated Murphey Elementary School in September 1960, recalled that the sit-ins had set a standard and "paved the way for more thoughtful integration."[5] It is unlikely that Campbell would have been elected the mayor of Atlanta in 1993 or that his brother Ralph, Jr., would have become the first African American state auditor in North Carolina in the same year, if not for the actions of civil rights activists throughout the nation pushing for integration and for black voter registration.[6]

Some of the 1960's era student activists returned to work at their respective colleges where they continued the tradition of promoting quality education, while maintaining their advocacy for social justice. One example included David Forbes, who became the Dean of the Shaw University Divinity School in 2014. Fellow Shaw graduate and 1960's era student protestor Louis Powell recalled Forbes's leadership in civil rights demonstrations. Powell remembers that Forbes' reputation on campus made him an obvious choice as a leader in the movement, and that his activism has carried on to this day. Powell compared him to the man who held the same position in the early 1960s. Powell paid Forbes perhaps the ultimate compliment, pointing out that he was and is an effective leader and also very dynamic, asserting, "He was the second Grady Davis."[7]

Forbes's experiences in Raleigh are a powerful reminder of the connection between the past and current social, political, and economic issues. He participated in

---

[5] Albert Sampson, interview by the author; William Campbell, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 11 September 2016.
[6] William Campbell, phone interview by the author; Mildred (Campbell) Christmas, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 10 September 2016.
[7] David Forbes, interview by the author, digital recording, 13 April 2016, Raleigh, North Carolina; Louis Powell, interview by the author, digital recording, 13 April 2016, New Hill, North Carolina.

"Moral Mondays" rallies in downtown Raleigh. The demonstrations, which were largely organized by the North Carolina chapter of the NAACP, opposed what the civil rights group and other activists believed was a regressive agenda by the General Assembly in regards to social programs, voting rights, education, and tax policy, which ultimately disproportionately hurt minorities and the poor. The protestors sought to put pressure on lawmakers to expand Medicaid coverage, raise the minimum wage, increase funding for public education, and repeal a law which required people to show state-issued identification in order to vote. On April 29, 2015, the second anniversary of the beginning of the "Moral Mondays" demonstrations, General Assembly police officers arrested twenty protestors after lawmakers complained they could not conduct business with the chanting outside of the Assembly building. The arrests brought the total number of arrests related to the protests since 2013 to more than one thousand. Forbes was among those taken to the Wake County Detention Center after being arrested for trespassing and violating the fire code on April 29, 2015, more than fifty-five years after he was arrested for participating in civil rights demonstrations at Cameron Village in Raleigh in February 1960. According to Forbes, "My mind went back to 1960 when I heard the jail door clang."[8]

The majority of student activists at the "Protest Triangle" schools perceived their participation in civil rights protests as part of their education. For many, their experiences in sit-ins and other demonstrations were part of what made their college

[8] Mark Binker, "49 Arrested at NC General Assembly 'Moral Monday' Protest," May 13, 2013, http://www.wral.com/49-arrested-at-moral-monday-protest-at-state-legislature-/12441971/; Jorge Valencia, "20 Protestors Arrested at NC General Assembly As 'Moral Monday' Protests Return," WUNC North Carolina Public Radio, http://wunc.org/post/20-protesters-arrested-nc-general-assembly-moral-monday-protests-return#stream/0; David Forbes, interview by the author.

experience a defining moment in not only their lives, but also in the lives of others who benefitted from their sacrifices. Among those students was John T. Avent, whose participation in the sit-ins in Durham ultimately led to a U.S. Supreme Court decision in *John Thomas Avent et al. v. North Carolina* after the North Carolina Supreme Court upheld the convictions for Avent and four other North Carolina College at Durham students, as well as two Duke University students. The highest court in the nation vacated the North Carolina Supreme Court decision and remanded it back to the North Carolina Court to reconsider. Ultimately, Avent never served the fifteen-day sentence that he received in 1960. Avent's experiences demonstrate the commitment that student protestors made toward advancing civil rights for African Americans. Avent believes that the sit-ins and the cases they inspired were not only crucial in getting the Supreme Court to essentially rule on segregation, but also that the cases involving sit-ins provided "the pillar of the Civil Rights Act."[9]

One of Avent's-lesser known experiences is also significant in understanding the student-led protests and their connection to ideas of academic freedom. After his graduation in 1963, Avent sought to apply to medical school. He decided to take a long shot and ask the recently retired president of NCC for a letter of recommendation, despite his doubts about whether Elder knew him. In their brief meeting, Elder agreed to write the letter, and without Avent mentioning the protests, Elder told him about how Mayor E.J. Evans had approached him in 1960 and asked him to reign in the student protestors and Elder said no. For the college president who had previously emphasized a concept of

[9] John Thomas Avent, phone interview by the author, digital recording, 12 July 2017; Chicago-Kent College of Law at Illinois Tech, "Avent v. North Carolina," Oyez, https://www.oyez.org/cases/1962/11.

"student self-direction," he was not willing to restrict the students' actions. To do so would have not only thwarted their right to protest against unjust social practices but also would have represented a restriction on their academic freedom. In a moment that likely reflected the thoughts of many older Durhamites, Avent recalls that Elder told him, "I'm proud of you students and all that you did."[10]

Student demonstrators at Shaw University, Saint Augustine's College, and North Carolina College at Durham literally proceeded from campus to counter to participate in sit-ins in the early 1960s. But they also acted as a counter to reactionary politicians and businesspersons, and for some, that struggle continues to this day. Mack Junior Sowell, the Shaw student who led protests in Raleigh in 1963, including those at the Sir Walter Hotel, which accommodated many state legislators, asserts, "Without the pressure, there weren't going to be changes. Even so today."[11] There have been powerful recent reminders that the struggle to challenge and encourage legislators and citizens to live up to ostensible American ideals of democracy and equality is not merely the work of a past generation. There are reasons for skepticism, but the actions of the 1960's era student protestors provided tangible results and hope that the bells of freedom can ring louder than the clink of the jailhouse door.

---

[10] Alfonso Elder, "The Evolution of a Concept of Student Self-Direction," Folder 28, Series 3, Speeches, 1960-1963, Alfonso Elder Papers, University Archives, Records and History Center in the James E. Shepard Memorial Library, North Carolina Central University, Durham, North Carolina; John Thomas Avent, phone interview by the author.

[11] Mack Junior Sowell, interview by the author.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archives

Atlanta, Georgia

King Library and Archives, Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Nonviolent Social Change

Martin Luther King, Jr. Papers
Southern Christian Leadership Conference Papers
Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee Papers

Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Allard Kenneth Lowenstein Papers
Floyd B. McKissick Papers

Charlotte, North Carolina

Special Collections and University Archives, J. Murrey Atkins Library, University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Harry Golden Papers

Durham, North Carolina

Rare Book, Manuscript and Special Collections Library, Duke University

Black History at Duke Reference Collection, 1948-2001 and n.d.
Evans Family Papers
Rencher Nicholas Harris Papers

University Archives, Records and History, North Carolina Central University

Alfonso Elder Papers

Nashville, Tennessee

Civil Rights Collection, Nashville Public Library

Series II, Civil Rights Ephemera Collection
Series III, Civil Rights Oral History Collection
Series IV, Civil Rights Periodical Collection

Raleigh, North Carolina

Archives and Special Collections, Prezell R. Robinson Library, Saint Augustine's University

James A. Boyer Papers

Joseph Holt, Jr. Papers
Archives and Special Collections, James E. Cheek Learning Resource Center, Shaw University
Miscellaneous Clippings Files
Shaw Journal Clippings
North Carolina Division of Archives and History
Governor's Papers, Luther Hodges
Governor's Papers, Terry Sanford
Governor's Papers, William B. Umstead
Olivia Raney Local History Library
Miscellaneous Clippings

Washington, D.C.
Manuscript Division, Library of Congress
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Papers

Newspapers

Campus Echo (North Carolina College at Durham student newspaper)
Carolina Times (Durham)
Carolinian (Raleigh)
Carolinian (Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, Greensboro)
Carrboro Citizen
Charlotte Observer
Chronicle (Duke University student newspaper)
Daily Tar Heel (UNC-Chapel Hill student newspaper)
Durham Morning Herald
Durham Sun
Florida Flambeau (Florida State University student newspaper)
Indy Week (Durham)
New York Times
News and Observer (Raleigh)
Pen (Saint Augustine's College student newspaper)
Raleigh Times
Shaw Journal (Shaw University student newspaper)
Southern Patriot (Southern Conference Education Fund)
Student Voice (Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee)
Tennessean (Nashville, Tennessee)
Wilmington Daily Record
Winston-Salem Journal

Interviews by the Author

Avent, John T. Phone interview by author, 12 July 2017. Digital recording.

Beatty, Celestine. Phone interview by author, 13 July 2017. Digital recording.

Bullock, Stafford G. Interview by author, 2 March 2016. Digital recording. Raleigh.

Brock, Carrie Gaddy. Interview by author, 2 March 2016. Digital recording. Raleigh.

Camm, Vivian (McKay). Interview by author, 27 April 2016. Digital recording. Lynchburg, Virginia.

Campbell, William. Phone interview by author, 11 September 2016. Digital recording.

Christmas, Mildred (Campbell). Phone interview by author, 10 September 2016. Digital recording.

Clayton, McLouis. Interview by author, 2 March 2016. Digital recording. Shaw University campus, Raleigh.

Culmer, Vannie C. Phone interview by author, 26 January 2017. Digital recording.

Cunningham, Pete. Phone interview by author, 21 June 2016. Digital recording.

Dansby, David. Phone interview by author, 14 June 2016. Recording in notes.

Dumas, Caroline. Phone interview by author, 13 July 2017. Digital recording.

Forbes, David C. Interview by author, 13 April 2016. Digital recording. Shaw University campus, Raleigh.

Holt, Jr., Joseph. Interview by author, 7 July 2016. Digital recording. Saint Augustine's University campus, Raleigh.

Lightner, Bruce. Interview by author, 16 June 2016. Digital recording. Raleigh.

Mayo, Fay Bryant. Phone interview by author, 1 February 2016. Digital recording.

Merritt, Ben. Phone interview by author, 26 January 2017. Digital recording.

Opton, Edward. Phone interview by author, 11 April 2016. Digital recording.

Othow, Helen Chavis. Phone interview by author, 13 July 2016. Digital recording.

Powell, Louis. Interview by author, 13 April 2016. Digital recording. New Hill, North Carolina.

Reynolds, Edward. Phone interview by author, 20 July 2016. Digital recording.

Riley, Walter. Phone interview by author, 14 June 2016. Digital recording.

Sampson, Albert. Phone interview by author, 12 July 2016. Digital recording.

Sowell, Mack Junior. Interview by author, 20 April 2016. Digital recording. Shaw University campus, Raleigh.

Tucker, Jr., Otis. Mail interview by author, received 5 May 2016.

Veasey, Millie Dunn. Phone interview by author, 27 June 2016. Digital recording.

Walker, Wyatt Tee. Phone interview by author, 15 July 2017. Digital recording.

Wyche, Sr., LaMonte. Phone interview by author, 29 June 2016. Digital recording.

Young, Andrew J. Interview by author, 18 May 2016. Digital recording. Atlanta.

Other interviews

Baker, Quinton E. Interview by Chris McGinnis, 23 February 2002. Interview K-0838. Southern Oral History Program Collection #4007. Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Cusick, Pat. Interview by Pamela Dean, 19 June 1989. Interview L-0043. Southern Oral History Program Collection #4007. Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Finlator, William W. Interview by Jay Jenkins, 19 April 1985. Interview C-0007. Southern Oral History Program Collection #4007. Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Pollitt, Daniel H. Interview by Ann McColl, 5 April 1991. Interview L-0064-7. Southern Oral History Program Collection #4007. Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Books, Articles, and Dissertations

Anderson, Jean Bradley. *Durham County: A History of Durham County, North Carolina*. 2d ed. Durham: Duke University Press, 2001.

Andrews, Kenneth T, and Sarah Gaby. "Local Protest and Federal Policy: The Impact of the Civil Rights Movement on the 1964 Civil Rights Act." *Sociological Forum* 30, S1 (June 2015): 509-527.

Baade, Hans, and Robinson O. Everett, eds., *Academic Freedom: The Scholar's Place in Modern Society*. Dobbs Ferry, New York: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1964.

Baker, Ella. "Bigger Than a Hamburger." *Southern Patriot* 18, 5 (June 1960): 4.

Billingsley, William J. *Communists on Campus: Race, Politics, and the Public University in Sixties North Carolina*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1999.

Birmingham, David. *Kwame Nkrumah: The Father of African Nationalism*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1998.

Bissett, Jim. "The Dilemma Over Moderates: School Desegregation in Alamance County, North Carolina." *Journal of Southern History* 81, 4 (November 2015): 887-930.

Blumberg, Herbert H. "Accounting for a Nonviolent Mass Demonstration." *Sociological Inquiry* 38 (Winter 1968): 43-50.

Borstelmann, Thomas. *The Cold War and the Color Line: American Race Relations in the Global Arena*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Branch, Taylor. *Parting the Waters: America in the King Years, 1954-1963*. New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1988.

Brinson, Linda Carter. "Edward Reynolds: Courage to Change a Campus." *Wake Forest Magazine* (Spring 2013): 3-9.

Brown, Hugh Victor. *A History of the Education of Negroes in North Carolina*. Raleigh: Irving Swain Press, Inc., 1961.

Brown, Leslie. *Upbuilding Black Durham: Gender, Class, and Black Community Development in the Jim Crow South*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008.

Bryan, G. McLeod. *Dissenter in the Baptist Southland: Fifty Years in the Career of William Wallace Finlator*. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1985.

Bynum, Thomas. *NAACP Youth and the Fight for Black Freedom, 1936-1965*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2013.

Carson, Clayborne. *In Struggle: SNCC and the Black Awakening of the 1960s*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981.

Carter, Dan T. *The Politics of Rage: George Wallace, the Origins of the New Conservatism, and the Transformation of American Politics*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1995.

Carter, Wilmoth A. *Shaw's Universe: A Monument to Educational Innovation*. Raleigh: Shaw University, 1973.

Carter, Wilmoth A. *The New Negro of the South: A Portrait of Movements and Leadership*. New York: Exposition Press, 1967.

Carter, Wilmoth A. *The Urban Negro of the South*. New York: Vantage Press, Inc., 1961.

Chafe, William H. *Civilities and Civil Rights: Greensboro, North Carolina and the Black Struggle for Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Chafe, William H. *Never Stop Running: Allard Lowenstein and the Struggle to Save American Liberalism*. New York: Basic Books, 1993.

Chansky, Art. *Game Changers: Dean Smith, Charlie Scott, and the Era that Transformed a Southern College Town*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016.

Clift, Virgil A, Archibald W. Anderson, and H. Gordon Hullfish, eds. *Negro Education in America: Its Adequacy, Problems, and Needs*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962.

Cortner, Richard C. *Civil Rights and Public Accommodations: The* Heart of Atlanta *and* McClung *Cases*. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 2001.

Covinton, Howard E., and Marion A. Ellis. *Terry Sanford: Politics, Progress, and Outrageous Ambitions*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1999.

Cummings, Richard. *The Pied Piper: Allard K. Lowenstein and the Liberal Dream*. New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1985.

Deroche, Andrew J. *Andrew Young: Civil Rights Ambassador*. Wilmington, Delaware: Scholarly Resources, Inc., 2003.

Drescher, John. *Triumph of Good Will: How Terry Sanford Beat a Champion of Segregation and Reshaped the South*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2000.

Dudziak, Mary L. *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Eagles, Charles W. *Outside Agitator: Jon Daniels and the Civil Rights Movement in Alabama*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993.

Ehle, John. *The Free Men*. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Ellsworth, Scott. *The Secret Game: A Wartime Story of Courage, Change, and Basketball's Lost Triumph*. New York: Little, Brown and Company, 2015.

Eskew, Glenn T. *But for Birmingham: Local and National Movements in the Civil Rights Struggle*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.

Fairclough, Adam. *Better Day Coming: Blacks and Equality, 1890-2000*. New York: Penguin Books, 2001.

Fairclough, Adam. *To Redeem the Soul of America: The Southern Christian Leadership Conference and Martin Luther King, Jr.* Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1987.

Finkin, Matthew W., and Robert C. Post. *For the Common Good: Principles of Academic Freedom*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Fleming, Maria. *A Place at the Table: Struggles for Equality in America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Forman, James. *The Making of Black Revolutionaries*. New York: MacMillan Company, 1972.

Furgurson, Ernest B. *Hard Right: The Rise of Jesse Helms*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1986.

Gaillard, Frye. *The Dream Long Deferred*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988.

Gershenhorn, Jerry. "Hocutt v. Wilson and Race Relations in Durham, North Carolina, During the 1930s." *North Carolina Historical Review* 78, 3 (July 2001): 275-308.

Grant, Joanne. *Ella Baker: Freedom Bound*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1998.

Greene, Christina. *Our Separate Ways: Women and the Black Freedom Movement in Durham, North Carolina*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005.

Hahn, Steven. *A Nation Under Our Feet: Black Political Struggles in the Rural South from Slavery to the Great Migration*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003.

Hartnett, Kimberly Marlowe. *Carolina Israelite: How Harry Golden Made Us Care About Jews, the South, and Civil Rights*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015.

Harvey, Paul. *Redeeming the South: Religious Cultures and Racial Identities among Southern Baptists, 1865-1925*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.

Hochschild, Adam. *King Leopold's Ghost: A Story of Greed, Terror, and Heroism in Colonial Africa*. Boston: First Mariner Books, 1999.

Hofstadter, Richard, and Walter P. Metzger. *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.

Holden, Charles J. *The New Southern University: Academic Freedom and Liberalism at UNC*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2012.

Hunter, Tera. *To 'Joy My Freedom: Southern Black Women's Lives and Labors After the Civil War*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Jackson, Thomas F. *From Civil Rights to Human Rights: Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Struggle for Economic Justice*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.

Jacoway, Elizabeth, and David R. Colburn, eds. *Southern Businessmen and Desegregation*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982.

Jaffe, A.J., Walter Adams, and Sandra G Meyers, *Negro Higher Education in the 1960's*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1968.

Jenkins, Clara Barnes. "An Historical Study of Shaw University, 1865-1963." Ph.D. Diss., University of Pittsburgh, 1965.

Johnson, K. Todd, and Elizabeth Reid Murray. *Wake: Capital County of North Carolina*. Vol. II. Raleigh: Wake County, 1983.

King, Arnold L. *The Multicampus University of North Carolina Comes of Age, 1956-1986*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987.

Klarman, Michael J. "The White Primary Rulings: A Case Study in the Consequences of Supreme Court Decision-Making." *Florida State University Law Review* 29, 55 (2014): 55-107.

Koopman, G. Robert, Alice Miel, and Paul J. Misner. *Democracy in School Administration*. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, Inc., 1943.

Lall Pugh, Candida. "Wouldn't Take Nothing for My Journey Now." *Veterans of the Civil Rights Movement* (2011). Accessed 22 January 2017. http://www.crmvet.org/nars/lall2.htm

LeLoudis, James L. *Schooling the New South: Pedagogy, Self, and Society in North Carolina, 1880-1920*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

Lewis, David Levering. *W.E.B. DuBois: The Fight for Equality and the American Century, 1919-1963*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2000.

Link, William A. *Righteous Warrior: Jesse Helms and the Rise of Modern Conservatism*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2008.

Link, William A. *William Friday: Power, Purpose and American Higher Education*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995.

Litwack, Leon. *Trouble in Mind: Black Southerners in the Age of Jim Crow*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998.

Lowenstein, Allard. *Brutal Mandate: A Journey to South West Africa*. New York: MacMillan, 1962.

MacIver, Robert M. *Academic Freedom in Our Time*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.

McAdam, Doug. *Freedom Summer*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

McClain, Linda. "Involuntary Servitude, Public Accommodations Laws and the Legacy of *Heart of Atlanta, Inc. v. United States*." *University of Maryland Law Review* 71, 83 (2011): 83- 162.

McEntarfer, Heather Killelea. "Catching Hell: The Joe Holt Integration Story." Terrain.org 22 (Summer/Fall 2008). Accessed 1 February 2016. http://www.terrain.org/essays/22/mcentarfer.htm

McGrath, Earl. *The Predominantly Negro Colleges and Universities in Transition*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1965.

McWhorter, Diane. *Carry Me Home: Birmingham, Alabama: The Climactic Battle of the Civil Rights Revolution*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2001.

Meier, August, and Elliott Rudwick. *CORE: A Study in the Civil Rights Movement, 1942-1968*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Miller, Steven Patrick. *Billy Graham and the Rise of the Republican South*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009.

Mitchell, Memory F. *Messages, Addresses, and Public Papers of Terry Sanford, Governor of North Carolina, 1961-1965*. Raleigh: Council of State, State of North Carolina, 1966.

Mitchell, Glenford E., and William H. Peace III. *The Angry Black South*. New York: Corinth Books, 1962.

Morgan, Iwan, and Philip Davies, eds., *From Sit-Ins to SNCC: The Student Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2012.

Moye, J. Todd. *Ella Baker: Community Organizer of the Civil Rights Movement*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2013.

Payne, Charles M. *I've Got the Light of Freedom: The Organizing Tradition and the Mississippi Freedom Struggle*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Perkins, David, ed. *The News and Observer's Raleigh: A Living History of North Carolina's Capital*. Winston-Salem: John F. Blair, 1994.

Pincoffs, Edmund L, ed. *The Concept of Academic Freedom.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1975.

Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: John F. Kennedy, 1963. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964.

Raleigh City Museum. *Let Us March On: Raleigh's Journey Toward Civil Rights*. Raleigh: Raleigh City Museum, 2000.

Ransby, Barbara. *Ella Baker and the Black Freedom Movement: A Radical Democratic Vision*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003.

Reagan, Alice Elizabeth. *North Carolina State University: A Narrative History.* Ann Arbor, Michigan: Edwards Brothers, Inc., 1987.

"Rev. Dr. Albert Sampson." *International Civil Rights: Walk of Fame.* Accessed 16 May 2016. https://www.nps.gov/features/malu/feat0002/wof/AlbertSampson.htm

Rogers, Ibram H. *The Black Campus Movement: Black Students and the Racial Reconstruction of Higher Education, 1965-1972*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2012.

Rohe, William H. *The Research Triangle: From Tobacco Road to Global Prominence*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.

Rosen, Richard A. and Joseph Mosnier. *Julius Chambers: A Life in the Legal Struggle for Civil Rights*. Chapel Hill: University Press of North Carolina, 2016.

Rustin, Bayard, and George Houser. "We Challenged Jim Crow!" Report prepared for CORE and the Fellowship of Reconciliation, April 1947.

Saint Augustine's College Ninety-Third Catalogue, 1959-1960. Raleigh: Saint Augustine's College, 1960.

Shattuck, Jr., Gardiner. *Episcopalians and Race: Civil War to Civil Rights*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2000.

Stone, Gregory, and Douglas Lowenstein. *Lowenstein: Acts of Courage and Belief*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Publishers, 1983.

Stoper, Emily. *The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee: The Growth of Radicalism in a Civil Rights Organization*. New York: Carlson Publishing, Inc., 1968.

Sugrue, Thomas. *Sweet Land of Liberty: The Forgotten Struggle for Civil Rights in the North*. New York: Random House, 2008.

Sutton, Jerry. *A Matter of Conviction: A History of Southern Baptist Engagement with the Culture*. Nashville: B&H Publishing Group, 2008.

Thorpe, Earle E. *A Concise History of North Carolina Central University*. Durham: Harrington Publications, 1984.

Wallace, Jim, and Paul Dickson. *Courage in the Moment: The Civil Rights Struggle, 1961-1964*. Mineola, New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 2012.

Vann, Andre D., and Beverly Washington Jones. *Durham's Hayti*. Charleston, South Carolina: Arcadia Publishing, 1999.

Waynick, Capus M., John C. Brooks, Elsie Pitts, eds. *North Carolina and the Negro*. Raleigh: Mayors Cooperating Committee, 1964.

Weisbrot, Robert. *Freedom Bound: A History of America's Civil Rights Movement*. Penguin Books, 1990.

Young, Andrew. *An Easy Burden: The Civil Rights Movement and the Transformation of America*. New York: Harper Collins, 1996.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY COMPOSITE RESULTS

GENERAL SURVEY COMPOSITE RESULTS

Please rate the following on a scale of 1-10:

1=Strongly disagree
10=Strongly agree

NOTE: You can choose any number between 1 and 10 based on how much you agree with the statement.

5.69 1) The civil rights demonstrations in Raleigh/Durham from 1960-1963 were primarily local and were not primarily reactions to events in Greensboro and other cities in North Carolina.

6.85 2) Teachers at Shaw University/St. Augustine's College/North Carolina College (whichever you attended) encouraged their students to take part in the demonstrations.

2.33 3) Mayor W.G. Enloe did his best to help Raleigh integrate restaurants, theaters, and other public accommodations.

5.85 4) Governor Terry Sanford (January 1961-January 1965) provided positive leadership in the civil rights struggle in North Carolina

3.08 4b) Governor Luther Hodges (November 1954-January 1961) provided positive leadership in the civil rights struggle in North Carolina.

4.58 5) There was one clear local leader of the desegregation demonstrations.

4.85 6) Leaders of the local movement feared for their safety and that of their families.

6.0 7) Demonstrators attempted to get African American bystanders to join the protests.

3.62 8) White men and women played a significant role in the demonstrations in Raleigh.

2.73 9) U.S. Military personnel (white or black) played a significant role in the local demonstrations.

5.77 10) The primary goals of the demonstrations were achieved (by the end of 1963).

5.85 10b) The primary goals of the demonstrations were achieved (by the end of 1964).

SURVEY- COMPOSITE RESULTS

Please rank the following institutions/groups in order of importance to the desegregation of public accommodations and to the reduction of discriminatory hiring practices in Raleigh (or Durham).

1=Most important institution/group 8=Least important institution/group

5.9 City Council

2.0 Local NAACP, SNCC, SCLC, or CORE

1.5 Shaw University/St. Augustine's College (or NC College at Durham) student organizations

2.17 Local Churches

4.36 Federal Government

4.82 Mayor's Biracial Committee

2.25 State and National NAACP, SNCC, SCLC, or CORE

5.0 State Government of North Carolina

SURVEY- IMPORTANT INDIVIDUALS- COMPOSITE RESULTS

Focusing on the period from 1960-1964, please rate the following people on a scale of 1-10 based on the following question: To what extent did the individual do all that was in their power to improve conditions for African Americans in Raleigh and/or in North Carolina? For any individuals that you were unaware of, please leave the line next to their name blank.

1=Individual did not make any effort to improve conditions for African Americans.
10= Individual did everything in their power to improve conditions for African Americans.

4.67 President Dwight D. Eisenhower

8.58 President John F. Kennedy

8.64 Lyndon B. Johnson

8.5 Robert F. Kennedy

3.44 Senator Sam Ervin, Jr.

3.0 Senator B. Everett Jordan

3.18 Luther Hodges (Governor, 1954-1961)

6.58 Terry Sanford (Governor, 1961-1965)

1.71 Dr. I. Beverly Lake

2.5 Mayor William G. Enloe (Mayor 1957-1963)

9.5 Reverend W.W. Finlator

8.83 Ella Baker

9.83 Ralph Campbell, Sr.

7.86 Dr. William R. Strassner

9.88 Dr. Grady Davis

8.67 Dr. James A. Boyer

SURVEY (STUDENTS) COMPOSITE RESULTS

Please rate the following on a scale of 1-10:

1=Strongly disagree
10=Strongly agree

9.83 1) You valued the opportunity to participate in the demonstrations if you chose to do so as part of the academic freedom afforded at Shaw University/St. Augustine's College (in other words, you believed that the college should not tell you whether or not you could participate).

8.25 2) Students viewed participation in the movement as a part of their education and as a way of opening societal opportunities.

7.1 3) You viewed student leadership as a counter to established city leadership.

8.91 4) You believed that whites would not "bestow" freedom, and that African Americans needed to struggle to earn freedom.

6.5 5) Student athletes played a prominent role in the local movement.

8.92 6) Student demonstrators believed they were participants in creating historical change, not just witnesses to history.

9.25 7) Female students were equally important to the local movement as men.

8.91 8) There was a high level of cooperation in regards to the demonstrations between students at Shaw University and St. Augustine's College.

7.5 8b) There was a high level of cooperation in regards to the demonstrations between students at Shaw University/St. Augustine's College (whichever you attended) and North Carolina College at Durham.

5.67 8c) There was a high level of cooperation in regards to the demonstrations between students at Shaw University/St. Augustine's College and State College (North Carolina State).

4.78 8d) There was a high level of cooperation in regards to the demonstrations between students at Shaw University/St. Augustine's College and the University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill).

4.7 8e) There was a high level of cooperation in regards to the demonstrations between students at Shaw University/St. Augustine's College and Duke University.

6.92 8f) There was a high level of cooperation in regards to the demonstrations between students at Shaw University/St. Augustine's College and other historically black colleges in North Carolina such as NC A&T and Fayetteville State (Teachers) College.

4.17 9) The local movement would have thrived even without support from civil rights groups such as the NAACP, SNCC, CORE, and SCLC.

8.83 10) You viewed participation in the demonstrations as potentially enhancing the positive reputation of your college rather than tarnishing its reputation.

3.92 11) There was some social pressure to participate in the demonstrations.